378.415
Su5u

UNIVERSITY EDUCATION

IN

IRELAND.

A LETTER

TO

SIR JOHN DALBERG ACTON, BART.

BY

WILLIAM K. SULLIVAN, PH.D., V.P.R.I.A.,
PROFESSOR OF CHEMISTRY TO THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND.

Second Edition.

The person charging this material is responsible for its return to the library from which it was withdrawn on or before the **Latest Date** stamped below.

Theft, mutilation, and underlining of books are reasons for disciplinary action and may result in dismissal from the University.

To renew call Telephone Center, 333-8400

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS LIBRARY AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

JAN 0 3 1983

DEC 0 4 1982

FEB, 8, 1996

JAN 1 7 1996

L161—O-1096

UNIVERSITY EDUCATION

IN

IRELAND.

A LETTER

TO

SIR JOHN DALBERG ACTON, BART.

BY

WILLIAM K. SULLIVAN, PH.D., V.P.R.I.A.,
PROFESSOR OF CHEMISTRY TO THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND.

Second Edition.

DUBLIN:
W. B. KELLY, 8 GRAFTON STREET.
LONDON: WILLIAM RIDGWAY, 160 PICCADILLY, W.
1866.

J. F. FOWLER, PRINTER,
3 CROW STREET, DAME STREET,
DUBLIN.

378.415
Su 5u

PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION.

I have only made a few verbal changes, and added a few sentences in the text of this edition. I have, however, taken advantage of the opportunity offered by its publication to give, as notes, some extracts from an article in the *Home and Foreign Review* on "University Education in Ireland". These extracts will abundantly show that the champion of the "dissentient element" among Catholics can never have read that publication, but must have derived his opinions concerning it, as well as the doctrines of the Church and "ultramontanism", from the periodical literature of a circulating library. I would especially recommend to the Editor of the *Daily News*, when next he is inclined to write about liberal Catholics, to get his information from other sources than Queen's College professors. I cannot help regretting that such a journal should have been so misled regarding Irish Catholic affairs as to write the following:

"The absence from Ireland of a liberal Catholic party, corresponding to that which is represented in England by Sir John Acton and the contributors to the defunct *Home and Foreign Review*, and on the Continent by such men as Montalembert, Döllinger, and Passaglia, has often been deplored—it would now appear, without reason. The party has, from obvious motives, been silent, but it existed. The Government has hitherto stood between Ultramontane principles and the attempt to reduce them to practice.

"The apprehended action of the Government in the matter of Irish University education has drawn forth a protest from an

B. K. S.
13 F 28
55300

Irish Catholic layman, which at the present time deserves to be considered seriously and even with deference. In a pamphlet on 'Freedom of Education', Mr. James Lowry Whittle, a barrister and a graduate of Trinity College, Dublin, denounces with great force of language, and combats with still greater force of argument, the design of placing the higher education of the Catholic people of Ireland in the hands of those whom he calls 'the emissaries of Italian fanaticism'. Mr. Whittle deprecates any action on the part of the Government which may throw its weight into the scale of the Ultramontane party, not merely on the ground of 'the hardships it will be to us educated Catholics, but the mischief and danger it will occasion to Ireland and the empire at large' ".

I can assure the Editor of the *Daily News*, that the liberal Catholic party, the absence of which he deplores, is very large in Ireland—it embraces nearly the whole Catholic body. But that party, I can equally assure him, is not represented by Mr. James Lowry Whittle and his co-dissentients. Let me further add, that when Irish Catholic liberalism shall be represented by such as he, it will be a misfortune for Ireland and a serious loss to the English liberal party.

CONTENTS.

Author's reasons for writing this letter. 1
The O'Donoghue's motion in Parliament in favour of the Catholic University; author's opinion of the proposal made by Government in answer to that motion; crusade of the ascendancy party against the proposal. What Irish Protestants and Presbyterians *have not* done, and what Irish Catholics *have* done for the liberal party. ... 2—5
Physical and intellectual destitution of Irish Catholics after the disgraceful penal times; how they set to work to remedy both wants. Establishment of schools; rise of clerical intermediate schools. ... 5—7
Higher education among Catholics. 8
Catholic intermediate schools on the whole creditable; much room, however, for improvement. The great want of Catholic education—an educational brain or university; comparative functions of the university professor and the collegiate school teacher; quality of intermediate education depends upon the University. The University of Dublin and the Queen's Colleges could not be intellectual centres for Catholic schools; ecclesiastical colleges not the natural centres of lay education. ... ... 9—11
Want of University education felt by Irish Catholics immediately after emancipation; Sir T. Wyse's three proposals in his memorial to the House of Commons:—
1. Full opening of the University of Dublin.
2. Establishment and endowment of a Catholic University.
3. Establishment of provincial colleges, and universities.
Meetings in Cork to promote the establishment of provincial colleges; Queen's Colleges Act of 1845. ... ... 11—13
Movement in favour of higher education in Ireland originated not with Protestants and Presbyterians, but with Catholics—not in Ulster, but in Munster; opposed by the majority of the Protestants now so favourable to the Queen's Colleges; Sir Robert Peel's intended secularization of Trinity College; Sir R. Peel said to have been dissuaded from this statesmanlike course.... ... ... 13—15
The majority of the chairs in the Queen's Colleges ought to have been given to Catholics; reasons given by the educational monopolists why this was not done. ... ... 15—16
Field of all science closed to Catholics; (character of Royal Dublin society; proposal regarding that institution;) number of Catholic professors originally appointed to Queen's Colleges; (chairs of "Celtic Languages"; *enlightened* proposal of Queen's College professors to abolish them). ... ... 16—18
Sir R. Peel apparently intended to appoint a number of Catholic professors; Earl of Clarendon's letter to Most Rev. Dr. Murray on the subject; non-fulfilment of the promise contained in that letter; Presbyterians consulted on the appointments, according to Dr. Cooke, 18—20

Catholics still unemancipated as regards literature and science; present position of Catholics as respects professorships of the physical sciences. 20
Absolute intellectual equality required by Catholics, not to be obtained by forcing the Irish mind into an English mould; refusal of Irish Catholics to be so coerced; establishment of an University; connection of religion with education. ... ... 21—25
Irish Catholics not desirous of handing over lay education to the clergy; the Catholic University not the creation of the clergy alone; Dr. Newman's "mediæval" university. ... ... 25—26
Catholic noblemen and commoners exert no influence on Irish affairs; growth of a Catholic middle class; character of Irish Catholic middle class society; upper and middle Irish Catholic society unreal and untruthful; influence of the bar upon the formation of Irish public opinion; position of Catholic lawyers; intellectual effects of Trinity College upon Catholics; the Catholic student of Trinity College a true *pseudomorphic* Englishman; political opinions of Catholic lawyers; present condition of affairs highly favourable to lawyers; qualifications for office in Ireland; what is usually called lay Catholic opinion is simply that of a few "liberal minded" and "educated" lawyers; University education until recently only of theoretical importance to the majority of Catholics; all Catholics in favour of exclusive Catholic intermediate education. ... ... 27—32
Sir Robert Peel, misled by the "dissentient" Catholics, attempts to elicit Catholic public opinion in favour of the Queen's Colleges; address of the "Peel Scholarship" Committee; complete failure of the scheme; analysis of the subscription list; answer of Catholics. ... 32—34
Lay and clerical mistakes on University education; as to discipline; as to the functions of an University;—case of Fitzgerald *v.* Northcote. 35—36
Professor Cairnes's first or statistical argument against the proposal to modify the Queen's University; the Lord Lieutenant's answer to the deputation of the General Assembly; "clerical pressure". Sir Robert Peel's flat contradiction of Professor Cairnes's statistics; tabular representation of Sir Robert's "gap". ... ... 36—39
Another "gap" in Catholic education in Ulster. Evidence of a still greater "gap" proved from the learned professions; author objects to reckon the Maynooth theological students as University students. 40—41
The number of pupils in superior schools does not support Professor Cairnes's theory of Catholic educational wants. Illustration of the "gap" in Catholic University education from the number of pupils above the age of fifteen in superior schools; conclusions deducible from this table—secret of Presbyterian fervour. Higher education should not depend upon wealth. ... ... 42—45
Relative proportion of academical and professional degrees taken by students of the Queen's Colleges. Analysis of Catholic students of the Queen's Colleges. The attendance of Catholic professional students at Queen's Colleges no proof that Catholics are satisfied with their existing condition. Professor Cairnes's argument of a *dernier ressort;* proof that *his* college is a *dernier ressort.* ... ... 45—48
Professor Cairnes's second argument—"Ultramontanism". What Ultramontanism really is. Two classes of Ultramontanes. Messrs. Cairnes and Whittle not aware of this; their difficulties, in consequence, of disposing of certain distinguished men. Mr. Whittle's blunder in considering the *Dublin Review* as the organ of the Church; (Bishop Clifford's recent opinion upon that publication.) ... ... 48—49
Mr. Whittle's descriptive character of the "Ultramontanes" who want a Catholic University; his "dissentient element" in the Church, of what it consists; the judicial constituent of the "dissentient element".

It is found that the "dissentient element" really belongs to the institution established to crush it. Character of Mr. Whittle's knowledge of the doctrines of the Church; author does not intend to notice his "dissent", but must point out some of his many errors of fact. ... 50—51
Messrs. Cairnes and Whittle's "immemorial custom"; this custom first proposed in 1815; true account of Dr. Cullen's appointment as Archbishop of Armagh. Dr. Cullen not a "monk" or director of "the Irish department of the Papal government"; where the "Ultramontane" idea of his appointment really came from; examples of cases where Messrs. Cairnes and Whittle's "immemorial custom" was not observed. ... ... 51—54
Ignorance of Messrs. Cairnes and Whittle about the office of apostolic delegate; their mistakes as to the time when, and the object for which, Dr. Cullen received that office; other apostolic delegates in Ireland besides Dr. Cullen. ... ... 54—55
Ignorance of Messrs. Cairnes and Whittle about the Synod of Thurles; the former apparently wholly ignorant of what a synod is. True history of the synod of Thurles; determined upon before Dr. Cullen was made archbishop, or came to Ireland; Mr. Whittle's "Papal court" had nothing whatever to do with it. ... ... 55—57
Another error of Professor Cairnes about the synod of Thurles; the "majority of one". ... ... 57—58
Professor Cairnes's absurd story about "the sick bishop". ... 58—60
Professor Cairnes's erroneous statement about Propaganda and mixed education; his curious authority for Irish ecclesiastical matters; is apparently indebted to his "dissentient" Catholic fellow-labourer for his "facts" on "Ultramontanism". 60
Mr. Whittle and the "*Mirari Vos*"; the true Catholic doctrine of religious toleration; (Father Perrone's opinion on this subject;) Mr. Whittle's opinion of religious toleration not that of liberal or enlightened men, but of bigots and despots. ... ... 60—64
Most Rev. Dr. Murray and the Queen's Colleges. ... ... 64—66
The Catholic University not the creation of Dr. Cullen and the Synod of Thurles. 66
Summary of some of the many errors of fact of Messrs. Cairnes and Whittle. 67
Summary of what the author has proved; justification of the Government in admitting that Catholics labour under a grievance, and in endeavouring to find a remedy. 68
Extraordinary sight at the head-quarters of Protestant ascendancy—the party admitting that that time-honoured principle has at length died, and that the "united" mourning cloak must be put on, in company with Presbyterians and other Dissenters. 69
Conclusion. 70

TO

SIR JOHN DALBERG ACTON, BART.

My dear Sir John,

You have always cherished the idea of a Catholic University in Ireland. Yours was one of the earliest names enrolled among its associate members when it was first opened by one very dear to both of us. You have sympathized with our labours as professors, partaken of our hopes of an useful future, and have been mindful of our struggles. As an Irish representative, you assisted in the pending negotiations about University education, which it was hoped would lead to an equitable settlement of the just claims of Catholics, and restore that calm amidst which alone academical studies can blossom and yield fruit. It is natural that I should address you upon the peril in which those negotiations are, owing to the opposition of a few persons, who, for their own ends, have taken advantage of the dogmatism of one class of liberals, and the latent prejudices of another, to sow dissension in the ranks of the liberal party, and, if possible, prevent the inevitable downfall of that ascendancy, which, and not the phantom "ultramontanism", is the true bane of Ireland. An additional reason, however, prompts me now to address to you this public letter. The *Home and Foreign Review* has been dragged into the controversy; and you as its chief editor, by name, and those who laboured with you, by implication, are put forward as members of a party, whose object is described to be the purification of Catholicism from what certain persons call "ultramontanism", and the removal of that bar to the development of free thought, the Catholic University! Much of the future of Catholicism is said to depend upon this "dissentient element", of which we are made part, not being driven out of the Catholic body, before its strength will have been properly developed for the struggle with "ultramontanism". I cannot allow Catholics, who believe that it is practicable

to combine a sincere attachment to the doctrines and practices of the Catholic Church with the fullest and freest cultivation of all human science and the honest adoption of the political principles of free nations, to become confounded in the minds of the English liberals with a few individuals, whose ignorance of the doctrines of the Church, of whose freedom they announce themselves to be the champions, is so lamentable. I emphatically deny that there ever was any danger of our being driven from the Church.

The strife regarding University education in Ireland had calmed down during the last few years. Catholics had become weary of claiming justice, and hopeless of dispelling the mist of prejudice which, after all our sacrifices in Ireland for the liberal cause, has so long prevented English liberals from understanding the true position of Ireland. An independent Irish member, The O'Donoghue, revived the discussion by his motion in the House of Commons on the 20th June, 1865. With the initiation of this motion the Catholic University had nothing whatever to do; it was the thoughtful act of the mover himself. But, when notice of the motion was given, we naturally felt bound to take advantage of the circumstance, and, aided by our friends, among others by yourself, negotiations were commenced which led the government to admit that we did labour under a disability which ought to be removed, and that they ought to propose such a modification of existing University arrangements, as would satisfy our just claims. This offer of the government was well received by the House of Commons—with the exception of Sir Hugh Cairns, the representative of Ulster Orangeism, Mr. Whiteside, the representative of Trinity College ascendancy, and Mr. Newdegate. It was considered a fair offer by the Catholic members, with the exception of Mr. Hennessy, who was in favour of an independent Catholic University; and The O'Donoghue accordingly withdrew his motion.

I consider the proposal of the government, provided it be carried out in such a way as to secure practical equality, preferable to an independent Catholic University. In a country where different religions are professed, and where the majority of the people have grievously suffered from the religious and political domination of a minority, it seems to me

to be necessary, in order to ultimately secure religious and political equality, as well as in the interest of true learning, that there should be but one standard by which the proficiency in knowledge of all academical students should be tested. Again, instead of adding to the list of medical corporations, every effort should be made to diminish the number of existing ones, and to introduce an uniform standard of medical examination. I also believe that the effect of the competition, which the introduction of the new element into the Queen's University would create, would be beneficial to true learning, while the constitution of the Senate would be a guarantee that the standard of education would be maintained, and competent examiners appointed.

The proposed change has not, however, given satisfaction to the ascendancy party in Ireland, because they know that a properly educated Catholic middle class would soon deprive them of a monopoly which they formerly defended in the name of conservatism, but which they now propose to maintain in the name of liberalism and enlightenment. From time to time, letters have appeared in the newspapers, especially in the *Daily News*, controverting some of the educational statistics used by The O'Donoghue on the occasion of his motion. The object of these letters was to reduce, if possible, a great question of national justice to one of mere numbers. Finding that this method did not effect the desired object, and that the government appeared resolved on carrying out, at least, what they had promised in June, other measures have been adopted to arouse public opinion against any concession of Catholic rights. A meeting was held in Belfast, purporting to be a meeting of the graduates of the Queen's University; it was not, however, regularly convened, and the great majority of the Catholic graduates knew nothing whatever about it. It appears to have been attended only by Protestant graduates belonging to the Queen's College, Belfast, with the exception of one Catholic, and he very naturally protested against the proceedings. The meeting appointed a deputation to wait on the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and afterwards upon Earl Russell. This deputation was headed by a Presbyterian barrister, and, so far as I could learn, only one Catholic, a young barrister, who could scarcely be considered a disinterested advocate, attended on either occasion. Had this "meeting of graduates" taken place in Dublin, where

the University holds its meetings, and had the majority of the Catholic graduates joined in it, I could understand the importance of its protest. But, so far from the Catholic graduates protesting against a change which would insure them a real representation on the Senate of their University, and help them ultimately in undermining the Protestant monopoly of offices and honours in it, and in the Queen's Colleges, they have presented a numerously signed counter-memorial to Earl Russell. A memorial signed by thirty-eight professors of the Queen's Colleges has also been addressed to the government, in favour of educational monopoly. Of the seven Catholic professors, only two have signed this document, one of them being a barrister.

Then came a discussion in the General Assembly of the Ulster Presbyterians, the result of which was a deputation of that body, with the Moderator at its head, to Earl Russell, calling on the way upon the Lord Lieutenant. We have next a memorial of the Wesleyan body; and I suppose, when all the correspondence shall have been published, we shall find a memorial from every sect in the country, praying that the Catholics may not be allowed to educate themselves after their own fashion, but that their education, so well conducted in past times, may continue to be entrusted to Protestants generally. In former times Irish Protestants memorialled to deprive us of all education. But things have so progressed that in the "nineteenth century", they only demand that we be preserved from educating ourselves; they regret the thinness of our intellectual food, and so would give us substantial mental pudding of their own making. Some of those men have even gone about boasting, that, by their influence with English liberals they will prevent the government from fulfilling the promises which they have made; nay, that, if necessary, they will drive the government from office, if it dares to touch their monopoly.

You may ask what influence can the party of ascendancy have with the liberals of England? What possible claims can it have upon the sympathy of the liberal party? It is true, the Presbyterians—and indeed the Protestants of every sect in Ireland—have, with some honourable exceptions, exhibited only the bitterest hostility to the liberal party. They have never returned a single liberal member to Parliament where they commanded a majority, while the Irish Catholics have sa-

crificed more for that cause than any other body in the empire. The Irish tenant farmers have braved the poor-house, the emigrant ship, and but too often a coffinless grave, to return those liberal members, Protestant as well as Catholic, by whose aid every liberal measure, from the Reform Bill of 1832 to the present time, has been carried in the British Parliament, and without whose aid that party would certainly not be in its present position. But you forget, perhaps, that all those services, all those sufferings of Irish Catholics weigh but little against the anti-Catholic prejudices of too many British liberals. The geographical distribution of their sympathies is governed, not by the spirit of justice, but by that of sectarianism; it is conterminous with anti-Catholicism. Shake but the red rag of "ultramontanism" before their eyes, and they become affected with mental colour-blindness. This operation has been performed by two barristers, Mr. J. E. Cairnes, a professor of Queen's College, Galway, and Mr. J. Lowry Whittle, a graduate of Trinity College. The latter comes forward as "a dissentient Catholic". Of the "dissent" there can be no doubt; of the Catholicity there may be much.

Before discussing the arguments of these gentlemen, and showing their mistakes, it will be necessary to point out the present position of superior education among Catholics, our educational wants in this respect, and the exact character of Catholic opinion respecting the question of academical education in Ireland. To do this I must go back a little into that painful period of our history, which we could wish blotted out for ever, were it not that we have still to look to it for the springs of many of the anomalies in our present social and political systems, and that we can only rightly understand the undying spirit of ascendancy which still flourishes, by tracing it back through the various metamorphoses it has undergone, as public opinion grew and changed.

The close of the eighteenth century found the Irish Catholics—the representatives of that Irish nation which had maintained for centuries a struggle with British power, and had just begun to emerge from the most disgraceful persecution ever waged against any people—without churches wherein to worship God, without schools wherein to educate their children, without real property, serfs upon the land which

had belonged to their ancestors, possessed of little or no brain or hand-skill, because the acquisition of both had been alike forbidden to them in their own land, and if acquired elsewhere, they were practically precluded from their exercise. This people, so often described as incapable of improvement, as hostile to the growth or spread of civilization, did not sink into the slough of despair, but nobly set to work to create the material and intellectual elements of culture. Every trade which did not require for its practice long training under skilled workmen, or from the exercise of which they had not been wholly excluded, was soon occupied by them; commerce, which requires no skill of hand, but only intelligence and some training, became theirs as the markets opened to them. And as they grew in wealth, they erected churches and schools, and ultimately colleges.

Immediately after the relaxation of the penal laws, a few collegiate schools were set up; but at first the chief efforts of Catholics were naturally directed to the establishment of primary schools. Those who could afford to pay for a better education of their children, sent them to the classical schools in the larger towns, which were conducted by Protestants. Catholics were even educated in essentially Protestant schools, such as the endowed schools, managed in most cases by Protestant clergymen. This state of things could not last. It was natural that Catholic parents should desire to place their children under the guidance of Catholics. It is simply absurd to assume, as is now often done, that, because Catholics went to Protestant or mixed schools when none others were to be found, therefore they preferred them to Catholic schools. Every religious body is anxious to educate its own members; but it is only when this wish is expressed by Catholics that it is attributed to bigotry. At all events, whatever may be said for or against mixed education, it can never be willingly or sincerely accepted where there is not absolute religious equality.

The qualifications of the majority of Catholic lay teachers could not have been of a very high order forty or fifty years ago. At that time the priests, many of whom had had the advantage of education in Continental Universities, were necessarily the best educated men in the Catholic body, just as Protestant clergymen of the Established Church in England

and in Ireland are amongst the best educated men, taken as a body, in the country. It was therefore natural that, whenever a school was set up by priests, Catholic children should be sent to it; just as among Protestants, the great majority of schools are in the hands of clergymen. Priests were in fact obliged to set up schools for the education of students for their own order, to supply the gap caused by the suppression of those ecclesiastical foundations on the Continent, upon which the Irish Church had hitherto depended for the training of candidates for the mission. But these schools had no endowments for their support; and hence it became necessary to widen their range by the admission of lay pupils as well as ecclesiastics, in order to insure a continuous provision for maintaining them in a state of efficiency. As these clerical schools grew up, the Catholic lay classical schools of a better class disappeared; just as the primary schools did when the national schools drew off the ordinary pupils, whose fees enabled teachers to support those schools. The lay teacher could not hope to compete with the clerical for many reasons, but especially for one—the natural desire of parents to combine religious with secular instruction. The result of the competition, or rather of its cessation, is shown by the fact that at least four-fifths of the Catholic males receiving superior education in 1861, were being educated in schools conducted by, or under the immediate direction of, priests. Every day this proportion, or disproportion, will increase, until, ultimately, all the intermediate education of Catholics shall have passed into their hands.

Whether it be desirable or not, that all the intermediate education of laymen should pass into the hands exclusively of ecclesiastics, and that an important career, which ought to be a spring of life to literature and science, and a resource to poor talent to enable it to reach its goal in other professions, should be closed up, is a question with which I am not now concerned. I merely state what has happened, and shall happen as the inevitable issue of the state of things existing in Ireland—a state of things which is the result of the long ascendancy of a party, and which that same party of ascendancy now seeks to perpetuate.

There are at present, in Ireland, sixty-seven such intermediate schools conducted by clergymen. Of these, twenty-four are diocesan seminaries, in all of which, with, I believe,

one exception, lay as well as ecclesiastical students are admitted; twenty-eight are classical schools, belonging to eight different religious orders; and fifteen are classical schools, maintained by secular priests, or under their immediate direction. Several of these schools may be fairly ranked as intermediate colleges. Irish boys are also sent in considerable numbers to similar collegiate schools in England.

To these schools, then, are sent the sons of all Catholics who can afford to pay the stipend, which, considering the average income of the Irish middle classes, is considerable. It must, however, be recollected that, except when situated in large towns, most of the youth attending those collegiate schools are in mensal residence, that is, live there altogether:—an important fact, which should not be forgotten when we are discussing the pecuniary ability of Irish Catholics to procure academical education.* The majority of the youth who frequent these schools remain in them until the age of sixteen or seventeen, and some even to the age of eighteen, when, unless they be intended for professions, their education is considered to be completed. Occasionally, a very few of the wealthier Catholics send their sons, though not intended for professions, to Cambridge, and latterly there has been a disposition to send them to Oxford. Of the professional students, the majority of those intended for the bar go to Trinity College, Dublin; indeed the chief part of the Catholic element in that college consists of law students. A few of those intended for the medical profession also go to Trinity College. The great majority of the aspirants to the latter profession receive no academical education; they pass directly from the clerical schools to private medical schools. Instances are numerous, where the future barrister graduates in the University of Dublin, while his brother "grinds" his way to a surgical diploma at some one of the private medical schools of Dublin. Since the establishment of the Queen's Colleges, many medical students go to them; because attendance at a few lectures in arts, such as French and natural philosophy, enables them to obtain the degree of M.D.

* According to the Census of 1861, the total number of Catholics receiving instruction in colleges, seminaries, and superior schools, was 6,243, exclusive of those in the purely ecclesiastical colleges of Maynooth and All Hallows. The Census Report contains returns from fifteen diocesan seminaries and twenty collegiate schools, in which the great majority of the pupils are in mensal residence. The number attending those schools in 1861 was 2,851, or an average of eighty-one pupils to each school.

With some exceptions, then, the only persons in Catholic society who can be considered to have received an academical education, are barristers, and such of the physicians as have graduated in the University of Dublin. I do not, however, mean to imply that all Catholic barristers are university men, or that many of the doctors of medicine of the Queen's University may not also have graduated in arts. What I mean is, that University education may be more generally predicated of Catholic lawyers, than of any other class of Catholics.

Considering the circumstances of the country, the short time that has elapsed since the first partial emancipation of education was effected, the absence of any considerable endowments, but, above all, the fact that the field of science was entirely closed to Catholics—and even still continues practically closed to them—the condition of the Irish Catholic collegiate and intermediate schools is creditable to the Irish clergy. It must, however, be admitted that there is much room for improvement. The classical languages are not taught in such a way, as to lay a sufficiently solid and extensive foundation for the subsequent acquirement of that accurate critical knowledge, which is one of the chief objects of academical education. Mathematics, for which the generality of Irish students exhibit true aptitude, are too often taught in the antiquated fashion of the pedagogues of the last generation, but not with the thoroughness which often distinguished them. The elements of the physical sciences can hardly be said to be efficiently taught in any of them. An acquaintance with the phenomena and laws of the physical universe must, henceforward, form an essential element of all real education; while, independent of its intrinsic value, a knowledge of physical science, generally diffused among the upper and middle classes of Ireland, would be the most effective and practical stimulant of the development and growth of successful industry. The backward state of this branch of education in Catholic schools is very easily accounted for. In the first place, the physical sciences require experimental illustration, which is expensive; and in the second, the teachers have not had an opportunity of learning those subjects themselves, or, above all, of working in proper practical laboratories.

The want to which I have just alluded suggests the true defect of Catholic intermediate education—the absence of an educational brain or University. The educational functions

of a collegiate school and of an University are very distinct. The duty of the teachers in the former is to give their pupils the elementary instruments of thought, the reading and writing of their own language, and, as far as may be, the languages in which are embodied the thoughts and actions of the two great peoples of antiquity, and of the more important peoples of our own day, the elementary properties of number and magnitude, or mathematics, the facts of geography, history, and, if practicable, the elements of the physical sciences. Here I am not concerned with religious instruction. The function of the University teacher is to show the youth, thus provided with his elementary intellectual tools, how to use them profitably, in increasing his stores of facts, developing his own reason, analysing the opinions of others, and by synthesis forming for himself a healthy opinion concerning the moral and physical laws of the universe, instead of merely reflecting the views of others. But, the University teacher has other functions, without the exercise of which he can but imperfectly fulfil those just stated. He must be a student of his own subject, occupied chiefly with its pursuit, and engaged in extending its boundaries. The collegiate or school teacher, too, may devote himself to the pursuit of some science;—would that this were generally so. But in his case, though it may be desirable, it is not essential to the due performance of his special functions, that he should do so.

The quality of the instruction of the middle and lower educational strata depends upon the intellectual force sent down from the University. Just as the brain receives through the senses the perception of things, and sends back through the proper nerves the force of volition; so the educational brain receives the rudimental, or rather amorphic ideas of the lower schools, fashions and develops them, and sends back to the schools and to society that intellectual nerve-force which somehow always in the end operates upon society, through the persons of its educated men. Take the Protestant intermediate education of England and Ireland. All the heads of its great schools are University men. These schools command the permanent or temporary services of graduates and undergraduates as teachers, who bring down into them the intellectual life of the educational brain, and initiate the youth with the spirit and traditions of their respective Universities. Thus the intellectual force of Oxford and Cambridge is

felt throughout the English schools. The most obscure village school of Scotland is under the direct influence of the Scotch Universities. So in Ireland the Protestant schools are extensions of Trinity College, pervaded by the spirit of the central institution, and feeling through it, sooner or later, and more or less, the pulsation of every wave of scientific progress.

But, where is the centre of intellectual force for Irish Catholic education? Does the University of Dublin perform that function? Do the Queen's Colleges? What link of connection exists between those institutions and Catholic collegiate schools? What intellectual authority have the professors of the former in the latter? To what extent do those Universities influence the courses of study, the method of teaching, the class books of the schools? Do the youth of those schools look upward to them as the goal of their studies? The graduates of the existing Irish Universities may occasionally teach in the schools; text-books written by their professors may be used in them; even students may be specially prepared there for the Universities; but these are all alike accidents—foreign elements—which affect not the general character of the schools.

Is there, then, no institution which can be considered to be the intellectual centre of Irish Catholic education? As the teachers of our intermediate schools are for the most part priests, it is evident that the ecclesiastical colleges must be the intellectual centres whence our schools derive intellectual vitality. Diocesan seminaries for ecclesiastical students may, perhaps, naturally centre in such institutions; but there is an evident incongruity that this should be the case with regard to the schools for laymen:—

> . . . . . ut nec pes, nec caput uni
> Reddatur formæ.

This position of Catholic education has been long felt, vaguely by the general mass of wealthy Catholics, but keenly by the few who rightly understand our intellectual condition. Very soon after Emancipation some of the leading Catholics, most of whom had been educated in Trinity College, Dublin,—and foremost among whom were Mr., afterwards Sir Thomas Wyse and Richard Lalor Sheil,—were desirous of opening not merely the halls of that institution, but also

its fellowships, scholarships, professorships, and other emoluments, to Catholics and to Protestant dissenters.

On the 9th of December, 1830, Mr. Wyse presented a memorial on the organization of education in Ireland, to Lord Grey, through the hands of Lord Stanley. That memorial embraced all degrees of education—primary, academical, collegiate, and university. Mr. Wyse stated that it was as necessary to have seminaries for the middle classes, as primary schools for the lower classes; and that there should be, in addition, provincial colleges, where natural history, chemistry, botany, agriculture, and the various other sciences would be taught. The portion of this plan relating to primary education was afterwards adopted as the basis of Lord Stanley's bill of 1831. The establishment of this part of his great scheme, encouraged him to try to carry out the second part also; he accordingly moved in 1832, for a select committee of the House of Commons to inquire into the mode of education pursued by the diocesan schools. The committee was granted, but it did not sit, and owing to a number of delays it was postponed to the following year. The report of this committee recommended that the diocesan and royal schools should be thoroughly reformed both in organization, administration, and instruction, and made to go as far as possible to give the youth of Ireland a sound elementary education. It further proposed that the government should endow in each county an academy for superior education; and lastly, it was proposed to establish provincial colleges which would stand in the same relation to the academies, as the latter would to the lower schools. Mr. Wyse also laid a memorial before Parliament, in which he stated that he deemed it essential to connect the college with the university. With this view he made three propositions to the government:

1. Either that Trinity College should be considered to be the University of Dublin, that is, it would not be necessary to found additional colleges; that this university should be thrown open to all without religious distinction. Or, that in addition to Trinity College, other colleges should be added to the existing University of Dublin, as the act of Charles II. empowers to be done. Among such colleges might be Maynooth College and the Presbyterian Theological College of Belfast. With perhaps the exception of

the theological ones, all these additional colleges might be open to persons of all religious denominations.

2. If the first proposition should be considered impracticable, a Catholic University endowed with all the honours, all the emoluments, all the advantages at present enjoyed by the University of Dublin, and its single college, Trinity College, should be established.

3. And "if the merits of this plan shall not be conceded", Mr. Wyse proposed a third plan, namely, "that provincial colleges should be established, one in each of the four provinces of Ireland, on a large and liberal scale—that each of those colleges should be founded on the plan of the London University—that is, comprehending an aggregate of colleges, and that each should be an university in itself".

No action having been taken with respect to the recommendations of the select committee, or of Mr. Wyse's memorial, a committee was formed in Cork for organizing a popular movement in favour of the establishment of colleges. Under the auspices of this committee, a great meeting was held in Cork on the 15th November, 1838, presided over by the Earl of Listowel, at which Mr. Wyse made a statement of his views. This meeting was called by a requisition signed by more than four hundred peers, members of parliament, magistrates, professional men, and amongst which were the two Catholic bishops, and the chief Catholics of influence in the county and city of Cork. This meeting directed public attention to the importance and necessity of University education, but it led to no immediate practical result. The committee, however, continued its labours, and on the 12th of November, 1844, a second meeting was held in Cork, at which Mr. Wyse again made a statement, in which he announced the approaching partial success of the movement. In the following year, 1845, the subject of academical education in Ireland was mentioned in the Queen's speech, and Sir Robert Peel introduced a bill to establish three provincial colleges, endowed by the state, which became law.

From the foregoing, it will be seen that the movement which led to the establishment of the Queen's Colleges originated in Catholic Munster, not in the so-called Protestant Ulster; its chief promoters were Catholics; Catholic bishops and priests signed the requisition; priests attended and spoke at the provincial meetings; and the only amendment pro-

posed at the Cork meeting of 1844 was moved by a Protestant. The same party that now so loudly proclaim the advantages of the Queen's Colleges, and wish to maintain a monopoly of the fruits of Catholic exertions, fiercely attacked the whole scheme then. It was only when success seemed to crown the labours of the Catholics of Munster, that the Presbyterians of Ulster suddenly discovered that they too wanted university education, and claimed a share of the prize. Such has ever been the conduct of that religious body, and indeed of the great majority of Irish Protestants. They have invariably obstinately opposed every claim of Catholics to obtain the smallest measure of justice in education, or in any other matter whatsoever. But the instant Government shows the slightest disposition to yield, and offers some miserable, halting compromise, they at once change their tactics, and endeavour to divert to themselves all its advantages, and having succeeded—and in this, it must be admitted, they receive every facility possible—they become the ardent champions of what they had a little while before just as vehemently condemned. In the debate in Parliament on Mr. Wyse's motion on Irish education, on the 19th of May, 1835, one of their representatives—Sir R. Bateson—expressed his decided opinion that the system of national education which had then been established in Ireland was wholly contrary to the feelings of the great body of the Presbyterians. What has brought about the thorough change in their opinion on the subject which they now so loudly proclaim, and are thrusting upon every one as an infallible dogma, and which they have invoked the English liberal party to enact into an irreversible law—for Ireland? That it is the growth of liberal opinion, no person cognizant with Ireland will dare to assert. It is *that they have modified that system to suit themselves.*

Sir Thomas Wyse tells us that he had asked for one college *at least*, in each province, but that the Government interpreted his demand as one *at most*. But it did not give even one to each province. There are four provinces, but only three Queen's Colleges. It does seem strange that, while the provinces of Munster, Ulster, and Connaught were each provided with a college, the important metropolitan province of Leinster should have been left unprovided. If there was a necessity for collegiate education in

the counties of Galway and Mayo, there must have been much greater need of it in the comparatively wealthy counties of Meath and Wexford, not to speak of Dublin. The omission of a college for Leinster implied a foregone conclusion on the part of Sir Robert Peel, to make Trinity College serve the purpose of a Queen's College for Leinster—to carry out in fact the first of Mr. Wyse's propositions. This would have required a complete revolution in its constitution; and it is well known that, at one time at least, Sir Robert Peel seriously contemplated secularizing Trinity College. His endowment of Maynooth College was only part of a general scheme, according to which he proposed to provide for the theological education of the Catholic and the Presbyterian clergy by grants from the Consolidated Fund, and those of the Church of England, by the foundation of an ecclesiastical seminary and divinity school, endowed out of the revenues of Trinity College; while the instruction of the laity should be provided for by the establishment of one metropolitan and three provincial colleges connected together as one national University, open to all without distinction of creed.

If the government desired to put all Irishmen on an equality, and to really take the lay education of all religious denominations out of the hands of their respective clergy, this would have been a statesmanlike course to have adopted. It is said that Sir R. Peel was dissuaded from carrying this plan into execution by the advice of some Irishmen, among whom were some Catholics. Whether he or any other British statesman ever contemplated adopting such a plan, which, whatever objections may be urged against it, would have had at least the merit, rare indeed in an Irish measure, of treating Protestants and Catholics alike, I cannot say; but I have heard one gentleman boast that he had advised Sir R. Peel not to disturb Trinity College.

Established, as I have shown, at the request chiefly of the Catholics of Munster, and ostensibly intended,—at least the colleges of Cork and Galway,—to supply the want of academical education, which Catholics alone appear to have felt, and also taking into account that Trinity College was left in the undisturbed possession of all its privileges and endowments, it would have been not only just, but wise, to have bestowed the majority of the chairs upon Catholics, at least in

those colleges which were situated in districts where Catholics formed the great majority of the population. It has been stated that Catholics were not appointed to them, simply because none competent could be found. And one of the professors, *ex cathedrâ*, asks lately, where could we get senior wranglers? Is it not a mockery for a member of that ascendancy party, which used in former times such unholy means to crush out every trace of mental culture from amongst us, and which now uses mean calumny and vulgar gibes, to ask us where are our senior wranglers? I have yet to learn that the great discoveries of physical science are due exclusively to senior wranglers. Why, the apothecaries of France and Germany have done more for physical science, than the united labours of the three richly endowed universities of the United Kingdom. Is it to classical gold-medallists, or University Fellows of those institutions that the world is indebted for the immense strides which are being made in classical and comparative philology? The professors even of Belfast and Galway are still obliged to borrow some of the happiest emendations of their texts, and many of the best illustrations of Greek and Latin archaeology and history, from the profound labours of modest, but *really* learned teachers of German Gymnasia. Are we also expected to believe that France or Germany could not furnish any Catholics competent to teach the modern languages? I assert, that if the object of the Government was to satisfy the just claims of the majority of the people of Ireland, and encourage the growth of learning among them, they could have found a sufficient number of young Catholics of education and ability to fill the greater number of the chairs in the Queen's Colleges, who, if they had not gold medals and parchments to show as their qualification, possessed, what would have been far better, the ambition to respond to the trust reposed in them, by shedding a lustre on the colleges by their labours.

At the period of the establishment of the Queen's Colleges, there was not in Ireland, or in Great Britain, so far as I know, a single professorship of any one of the physical sciences open to a Catholic layman, save those in University College, and the Royal Institution in London, which, perhaps, were theoretically open, but most certainly would have been practically closed to a Catholic, especially if he had the additional disqualification of being Irish, and also those of the Royal Dublin

Society.* With the whole field of the physical sciences, the great element of modern philosophic discussion, and intellectual progress, closed by law or prejudice against Catholics—indeed with the whole field of all science closed against them, it was unlikely that many would devote themselves to their cultivation. Nevertheless, in the period immediately preceding the foundation of the Queen's Colleges, the germs of a love of science had begun to bud among Irish Catholics, and had they been fostered, would have soon expanded into blossoms and fruit. I recollect myself how rapidly and widely a taste for science was being developed among young Irish Catholics just then, and the rude shock which the aspirations of many received on finding that the new colleges, like the old, were not to be for them. We saw that the old code was still in full force, although the new edition wore a liberal binding.

Of the twenty professors appointed to Queen's College, Belfast, two only were Catholics,† the professors of geology

* This is an ancient society established for the promotion of husbandry and the useful arts, and, as might be expected of a society founded in the first half of the eighteenth century, an essentially Protestant body, pervaded even still by the very worst spirit of ascendancy, as was evidenced the other day in the election—now reported to have been illegal—of a new council. To this body successive liberal governments have unaccountably continued to entrust large funds intended for the use of the general public, and which they have practically applied to their own uses. Even still, the government leaves in their hands the management of our National Museum, Botanic Garden, and Library. Not satisfied with this monopoly, two years ago this body attempted to suppress the only institution which proposes to teach science for practical purposes, to put in subserviency to itself the highest public body for the promotion of science and literature in the country, the Royal Irish Academy, and the highest for the promotion of the fine arts, the Royal Hibernian Academy. These attempts were, however, fortunately frustrated by the intervention of a committee of the House of Commons. On one occasion this body having got into bad odour with parliament and the public by blackbeaning the late Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Murray, and being desirous of showing how repentant it had become, actually elected a Catholic professor of natural philosophy! It is time that the people of Ireland should demand that the National Library of Ireland should be taken out of the hands of the exclusively Protestant council of the Royal Dublin Society, and administered for the benefit of the entire public, by trustees in whom the majority of the people could have confidence, and that the privilege enjoyed by Trinity College under the act of parliament (54 Geo. III., cap. 156) of getting a copy of every book published in Great Britain, should be transferred to it. Why do not those who talk so much of the benefits of unsectarian education propose such reforms as will give us an unsectarian public library?

† I believe the gentleman first appointed to the chair of Materia Medica was a Catholic, but he resigned before the colleges were opened.

and Celtic languages.* Of the twenty professors appointed to Queen's College, Cork, only three were Catholic, two in the faculty of medicine, and one in that of law. In Catholic Munster there was not a single Catholic appointed in the faculty of Arts, the only faculty which is to be taken into consideration for my purpose. The salaries attached to the medical chairs were not sufficient to induce men of established reputation to settle in provincial towns; consequently, with the exception of anatomy, which may be reckoned among the scientific chairs rather than among the professional ones, they were in almost every instance given to local surgeons and physicians. Of the twenty professors appointed to Galway, only two Catholic professors were appointed to the faculty of Arts, the professors of Mathematics, and History and English Literature.

Sir Robert Peel appears to have had some intention of infusing a Catholic element into two at least of the colleges, those of Cork and Galway, as is shown by the appointment of Catholic presidents to those colleges, one of them being even a priest. This appears to have been the intention of the Earl of Clarendon also, as appears from a letter to the Most Rev. Dr. Murray (19th March, 1848), in which he says:

" . . . Moreover, in the *Council, professorships, and other posts of each college, the Catholic religion will be fully and appropriately represented*, for these colleges are instituted for the education of the middle classes, and the government would fail in its object of training up the youth of Ireland to be good men and loyal subjects, if their religious instruction and moral conduct were not duly provided for, and guarded by every precaution that the most anxious solicitude can devise".

* These chairs were very absurdly called chairs of " Celtic Languages": they ought to have been called chairs of Irish language. The Belfast chair was occupied by the great Irish scholar, John O'Donovan, who had no class, for the subject did not form part of the regular undergraduate course, and who had the munificent salary of £100 per annum. Such as they were, these chairs with paltry salaries were the first patronage bestowed by the State upon the ancient languages of the empire, and an important but little studied branch of the Aryan family of languages. Some of the professors of the Queen's Colleges actually recommended their abolition, and the commission appointed to examine into the condition of the colleges in 1859, proposed that this enlightened recommendation should be acted upon. Two of them have been, if not legally, practically abolished. As a commentary upon the scientific appreciation of those who recommended the abolition of the chairs of " Celtic Languages", I may mention that steps are being taken to found such a chair in Edinburgh; and I believe there is an idea of having one at Berlin also!

Will Lord Clarendon say that this promise has been fulfilled? It is now seventeen years since the colleges were opened, and several changes have been made in the professorial staffs. Has the Catholic element increased? On the contrary, it has diminished in the faculty of Arts. The single Catholic professor in the faculty of Arts in Belfast has emigrated, and has been replaced by a Protestant. In Galway the Catholic element has likewise disappeared wholly from the faculty of Arts; but in Cork there has been a gain of one, so that Queen's College, Cork, is the only one which has a Catholic professor in the faculty of Arts. Exclusive of engineering, agriculture, and Celtic languages, and taking into account the amalgamation of chairs which has been effected in Belfast and Galway, there are now in the faculties of Arts of the three Queen's Colleges twenty-eight chairs, of which only one is filled by a Catholic.

Are we to attribute the non-fulfilment of Lord Clarendon's promise to the advice of some "dissentient" Catholic officials, who were anxious to enhance their value by showing how independent and free from the taint of "ultramontanism" they were? I fear this is the true explanation. But the Presbyterians thought it more prudent to secure their share of the prize, before they put on the cloak of the "*Friends of Civil and Religious Liberty*", which so well becomes them now. At the meeting of the General Assembly, held October 3rd, 1849, a resolution was offered permitting Presbyterian students to attend the Queen's College, Belfast. Dr. Molyneux proposed, and Mr. James Gibson, a really enlightened man, seconded an amendment to the effect, that the Queen's Colleges of Cork and Galway should be included in the permission. The Rev. Dr. Cooke, the newly appointed Presbyterian dean of residence, opposed the amendment, saying:

"One chief reason why our students should go to the Queen's College here [Belfast], is because we are satisfied of the capacity of the teachers under whom they will be placed; and the principal reason why we will not put the Colleges of Cork and Galway on the same footing, is, because we are dissatisfied with respect to some of the professors there, and consider them disqualified for instructing our students".

He is reported to have added:—

"The fact was, he had stated his conviction to the Government,

that if a Roman Catholic, or an Arian, were appointed to any of the chairs, he for one would advise their students not to attend any of these classes. The reason he would vote for the Queen's College here, and object to the amendment, was because the appointment of the professors had been made with a view of satisfying the Presbyterian people, whereas in Cork and Galway, the appointments were made to please Roman Catholics".

That the appointments, not only in Belfast, but also in Cork and Galway, were made to please the Presbyterians, there cannot be the slightest doubt. I have shown how far they were made to satisfy Catholics.

Previous to the establishment of the Queen's Colleges, Catholics were told that they had no reason to complain on the subject of university education, because they might, and did, receive education in Trinity College, and take degrees in the University of Dublin. We are now told that we may and do receive education, not only in Trinity College, but in the Queen's Colleges, and take degrees not only in the University of Dublin, but also in the Queen's University. But now, as then, we may answer in the words of the *Morning Chronicle*:*

"This is surely a narrow view of the question. Professorships and fellowships are natural objects of ambition to students of ability. If literary or scientific talent be deprived of its natural reward, by closing up the avenues through which it might develope itself, it is a hardship quite as grievous and as unjustifiable as was formerly the denial of promotion to Catholic barristers or Catholic officers. The legal and military disabilities of the Roman Catholics have been removed; but in literature and science they are still unemancipated. Now, if there be any one object which a wise statesman would desire to promote in Ireland, it is the rise of a class of learned and scientific Roman Catholics, whose main pursuits, by bringing them into sympathy with men of different political and religious principles, would create new links of friendly union between the opposing masses, into which the Irish people are divided".

The actual position of Catholics with respect to those natural objects of ambition, Professorships and Fellowships, is well shown by the following table, which gives the total number of professorships, lecturerships, etc., paid by the state,

* February 1st, 1845.

or supported by public endowments for teaching the physical sciences in Ireland, and the emoluments of which are £100 per annum and upwards:

	Total number.	No. held by Catholics.
Mathematics, ...	5	1
Natural Philosophy and Astronomy, ...	10	3
Chemistry, ...	7	1
Geology and Mineralogy,	8	1
Natural History, ...	7	–
	37	6

In this table I have included the professorships of natural philosophy and mathematics of Maynooth College, and the training department of the Board of National Education. If I were able to add the emoluments of each chair, the contrast would be still more striking, for it would be found that three chairs in Trinity College exceed in value all those possessed by Catholics in Ireland.

I shall be told that the true qualification for a professorship ought to be the knowledge of the subject to be taught, and not the profession of a creed. Why do not those who think so denounce Trinity College, when it advertises that none but Protestants need apply, even for a portership? Why should the principle be only recollected when Irish Catholics endeavour to give voice to their imprisoned intellect? I am answered that this spirit of exclusiveness was the work of other times, and that no such institution would now be established. But we are still in the mental prison-house which this intolerance built up; let it be pulled down before we are asked to accept what it is now the fashion to call equality and freedom. To be able to accept such a principle, there should be absolute equality. All religious tests should be abolished, not only in endowed colleges and schools, but in all public offices, and not merely in *theory*, as is the case to a great extent now, but in *practice;* but, above all, Catholics should have time to elevate themselves to an intellectual equality with their Protestant fellow-countrymen. Let that be attained, and we shall hear no more of this controversy between Protestants and Catholics within the domain of literature and science. We shall all be able to mingle therein

freely, and all alike contribute our offerings to the common stock of human knowledge.

But how is this intellectual equality to be attained? Certainly not by the process which has heretofore been tried. As each kind of fermentation can only be induced by its specific ferment, so each people has its own specific type of mind, which is best influenced by its own ferment. It is difficult to induce a spirit of change and progress upon the mind of a people by influences external to itself,—impossible, if it be attempted to induce it against its will. Encourage a people to educate themselves after their own fashion, put the means to do so into their hands, and the work will be soon done. But try to force the mind of one people into the intellectual mould of another, and one of two things must happen; either the people resist, and no advance is made, or they yield, but their special mental type is obliterated. All great political empires are formed by the fusion of many nationalities; but the fusion of two peoples does not necessarily imply the obliteration of the mental type of either. The more of both types that can be preserved, the more vigorous will be the compound, the more varied and fertile will be its genius. Obliterate the specific mental type of a people, by forcing its mind to accommodate itself to the mould of another, and what do we get? the form, but not the substance. The English and Scotch people have fused inseparably together. Why? Because the English, instead of persisting to obliterate the distinctive features of the Scotch, allowed them, even when a little external thought might have done them good, to follow their own law of mental evolution, to retain their own laws, set up their own church, settle their own religious disputes, educate themselves after their own fashion. The University of Oxford did not force its system upon the Scotch Universities. The English episcopalians, after having learned a lesson of wisdom from the Scotch, left them to fester in their intolerance and fanaticism, from which they will sooner or later emerge chastened. How different has been the conduct of Great Britain towards Ireland! When Irish Catholics are in question, Scottish Presbyterians, high-churchmen, low-churchmen, and no-churchmen, tories of the old school and of the Orange type, and *doctrinaire* liberals, all enter into an unholy alliance to force the mind of Irish Catholics into a mould, which is not

after the pattern of any of their own, and which the majority of each steadfastly refuse to adopt for themselves.*

The Irish Catholics have refused to be coerced in this way. The poorest body in one of the poorest countries of Europe, in addition to supporting its own clergy, now numbering more than 3,000, building the 2,328 churches, or more, which are dotted over the country, and which have all been erected within this century at an expense of more than £3,000,000, building primary and intermediate schools, founding charitable institutions and hospitals, have, since the establishment of the Queen's Colleges, applied the sum of £130,000 to found and support an University. We are told, however, that the foundation of this University was a purely clerical work, intended for the purpose of keeping lay education in the hands of the priests, and that all educated lay Catholics keep aloof from it. We are further told that all intelligent lay Catholics are opposed to exclusive Catholic education, and in favour of mixed education.

It may be assumed that the authorities of all churches must be anxious to maintain intact the faith of their members. This anxiety must be greater in the case of the Catholic

* "But if, for these reasons, it is highly impolitic to prevent any class of her Majesty's subjects from getting more than that little knowledge proverbially so dangerous, it is no less so to retain any portion of the community in a condition of unjust inferiority. Injustice always produces, and always ought to produce, discontent. Discontent produces agitation. It introduces virulence into party struggles, and turns those divisions which must exist in every free country into feuds. These and many other evils must be the inevitable results of excluding Catholics from academical degrees except on the condition of their violating their consciences. For the sake of injuring the Catholics the state injures itself. In principle there is no difference between this conduct and that of the state at an earlier time, which actively persecuted them, and excluded them from the acquisition of property or the enjoyment of political power. It prohibited the attainment of the end: we now exclude them from the means by which the end is to be obtained. The Catholic youth are forced to enter into the battle of life, and to contend with their Protestant fellow-countrymen, without being allowed the same preparation as their rivals possess for the conflict. And this is done by men who call themselves liberal statesmen, and in the name of liberty. Thirty-four years after Catholic emancipation, twenty-nine years after the grant of a university charter to English Dissenters, Irish Catholics ask to be allowed to obtain degrees for their children on the condition of their attaining a certain intellectual standard which they are willing to allow the state to fix; and this request is refused. The prime minister cries 'priestcraft', though in the Catholic University twenty out of the twenty-five professors are laymen; while he supports the Protestant University of Dublin, where twenty-five out of thirty-three of the governing body are clergymen"—*Home and Foreign Review* for January, 1863, p. 44.

Church, whose authority is paramount in matters of faith, and which allows no latitude to individual judgment in established articles of faith. It is quite true, that there is no Catholic geology or mathematics, nor Protestant chemistry; the physical sciences have their own methods of induction from well established sensible phenomena, which the experience of any one can incontrovertibly test, and from these methods there can be no deviation without error. Neither can there be a Catholic or Protestant logic, metaphysics, ethics, philosophic history, or political economy; for the rational sciences are, all alike, the inseparable inheritance of human reason, wherever it is to be found, as truth itself is one and indivisible. But these sciences have this special characteristic, that, unlike the physical sciences, they do not induce from the phenomena of sensible experience, but deduce from premises of a wholly different order, and concerning which any amount of plausible error may happen to be assumed.* For this reason, precisely, the

* "It would require too large a space to carry out an inquiry as to the character of the education which is given in these institutions, even to those who complete their university course; it is enough to say, that modern history is not taught, and that if it were, the religious sense of some of the pupils would infallibly be offended. Catholic youths could not be required to listen to Protestant versions of that period,

'When love first taught a monarch to be wise,
And gospel truth looked forth from Boleyn's eyes';

and the witness which history, impartially investigated, bears to the position and prerogatives of the Holy See could not be listened to by Protestant students without danger to some of their religious opinions. Some attempt, we believe, is made to teach moral philosophy. We do not envy the professor who approaches the sciences which have reference to freedom of the will, the law of duty, and the other subjects treated of by Locke, Clarke, Reid, Cousin, and those other philosophers to whose works reference is made in the examination-questions at the several Queen's Colleges, with a sincere desire to avoid every thing that can be offensive either to Protestant or to Catholic ears. In point of fact, the examination-papers appended to the reports of the presidents of the colleges show that even controversial questions are not avoided. We give a single example: 'Wherein did Anthony Collins and Jonathan Edwards agree, and wherein did they differ, as to freedom of the will?' Are the works of Jonathan Edwards suitable reading for Catholic students? They are preëminently controversial; and their end and object is to teach ultra-Calvinism. In one word, moral philosophy and metaphysics cannot be properly taught in mixed colleges, any more than history and theology. To abstract these sciences from education is to go against the authority of all ages, against the practice of all countries, and to take away the best and most effectual means of developing the intellectual faculties and forming the mind of youth. "Infelix operis summa, quia ponere totum nesciet", is the motto which ought to be placed over the gates of the Queen's Colleges"—*Home and Foreign Review* for January, 1863, p. 42.

authorities of the Catholic Church were desirous of having such subjects taught to Catholics by persons in whose opinions they could have confidence, and whose knowledge of Catholic doctrines they considered sound. So long as any one admits the principle of a church, he must admit the reasonableness of this demand. The opponent of all churches, and the advocate of emancipation from all religious authority, does not of course admit such a right on the part of any clergy; but he must admit the right of persons to hold any opinion they choose, and to educate their children as they think fit. To substitute the opinion of the State, which is the opinion of a certain number, for that of the parent, would be tyranny, and worse than any spiritual tyranny. If Catholics, then, choose to admit the right of the clergy to have an influence upon the mode of teaching those subjects which are intimately associated with, nay perfectly inseparable from, religious dogma, they are perfectly entitled to do so. And if this legitimate influence had been deferred to, at least practically, at the establishment of the Queen's Colleges, we should not have had the continued strife which has endured ever since, and in which the intellectual force of all alike has been uselessly exhausted.*

A perpetual struggle has been waged to deprive the Irish bishops and clergy of all rights whatever. Ought we then to be surprised, should we find them overstepping the limits of their own province, and taking upon

* "Those must indeed estimate their children by a false standard, who imagine that they can breathe without danger an atmosphere from which religious teaching and example are excluded.

"It is needless to insist further on this point. Admit the Catholic, or even the Christian premiss, and the conclusion generally follows. The Catholics of Ireland would be unfaithful guardians of the heritage 'they from their fathers had in trust', if they consented to any transaction in this vital matter. Deny the premiss; admit faith to be superstition and morality unattainable, and then there can be no objection to colleges which neglect both the one and the other. Those who approve of godless colleges must, if they are consistent, approve also of godless families.

"In order therefore that these colleges may succeed, Catholic faith must become dim in Ireland. Ignorance, or weakness, or worldliness, quarrels with the clergy, narrow circumstances,—these things will always furnish a certain number of candidates for scholarships and prizes, and prospects of future advancement in government departments. But the more the problem of education is studied, the louder will conscience reproach those who for material advantages hazard the best interests of their sons. To such as shut their ears against warnings, experience will speak trumpet-tongued"—*Home and Foreign Review* for January, 1863, p. 46.

themselves the functions and the rights of laymen in education or other matters? But it would be a great mistake to suppose that the Irish Catholics are desirous of handing over lay education of any degree to the exclusive control of the clergy; and if they seem at any time to do so, it is because they see that the opponents of both alike would take advantage of any temporary disunion between them to magnify lay independence into religious dissent, and to perpetuate Protestant ascendancy and political injustice. The Catholic University is not the creation of the clergy alone. Every educated Catholic in Ireland and in Great Britain, who at all understood the educational wants of Catholics, and whose personal interests did not clash with his better judgment, hailed the establishment of a Catholic University with pleasure. The man to whom the Irish bishops entrusted its formation was an additional guarantee that it would fulfil the functions of a great intellectual centre of the Catholic mind, whence, and whence alone, could possibly go forth in time the spirit which should renovate Ireland. I shall be told that Dr. Newman's ideal of an University was mediæval, and unsuited for modern times. Professor Cairnes tells us: "Under these auspices [*i.e.* the committee of the Synod of Thurles] appeared in due time, in the middle of the nineteenth century, 'the Catholic University of Ireland', established, in the admiring language of its accomplished advocate, on 'the eternal principles which regulated the relation of the Catholic Universities of the middle ages'." (p. 8). I do not understand what Mr. O'Reilly, M.P., the advocate alluded to, means by the "eternal principles", etc.; but this I know—that Dr. Newman's plan of an University does happen to be as much in harmony with the "nineteenth century", *save only in its Catholicity*, as any other institution Mr. Cairnes could point to. Had he known anything of Dr. Newman's ideas upon University education, and had he made himself acquainted with the plan of his University, he would have found that the "mediæval" Catholic University was established upon a far freer basis, and had a much wider scope, while it made even a more liberal provision for teaching the physical sciences, than the Queen's Colleges. When a young student sneers at the ignorance of some labourer of old in the field of science, he may be pardoned, if, in the self-sufficiency of a wider knowledge, he has forgotten the standpoint of his predecessors, and that we in our

turn shall one day be "mediæval" to our successors. But such a sneer on the lips of a professor, betrays a forgetfulness of a great truth, of which I would have supposed Professor Cairnes, of all men, incapable,—the law of the historic evolution of knowledge.

If the Catholic University has not had the measure of success which its organizer anticipated, it is not that it was behind the age, but, in part, because it was in advance of public opinion in Ireland. Other causes there were also, but in my opinion, at all events, they were secondary. Before discussing the subject further here, let me speak of Irish Catholic public opinion, for it is a matter that requires to be well studied by any one who desires to understand the social and political condition of Ireland.

The few Catholic noblemen and wealthy commoners connected with Ireland, emancipated by the sacrifices of Irish peasants, have retired into the peaceable enjoyment of the social equality thus won for them, and exert no influence whatever upon Catholic affairs or Irish public opinion. I do not say that there is not some excuse for their desertion of what is obviously their duty. But, however disagreeable it may be for those who can have but few personal ends to serve by mixing in Irish politics, it always seems to me a selfish policy to retire from the fight after obtaining the only substantial results of the campaign, and leave those who gained them to continue the battle as best they may. In any case the number of persons who were able to retain some landed property through the penal times, even when reinforced by those who have recently become Catholics, is insignificant. There is, however, an important middle class, created, as the middle class has ever been, by industry, which is continually increasing, and would increase still more rapidly were Ireland to become industrially prosperous. And as it is from this class that the professional men almost exclusively spring, every increase in their number has been accompanied by a corresponding increase in the proportion of Catholic physicians, lawyers, engineers, etc.

I do not know of any country in which such a middle class as that existing among Irish Catholics, has been created under such adverse circumstances, or in so short a period of time. Its growth is an evidence of the wonderful recuperative power of the Irish people, and a promise of still better

things in the future. A society, like that of the Irish middle class, which has no traditional culture, which has not had the advantages that spring from centres of intellectual thought, and whose educational institutions have grown up so rapidly, must possess all the defects of new societies; while the peculiar circumstances of Ireland have not been favourable to the development of the corresponding virtues. Foremost among these virtues should be a love of truth and self-assertion. In a country which may be said to have no aristocracy, and yet the current of whose social life is nevertheless eminently aristocratic, newly enriched Catholics strive by every means to become "respectable". The most prominent indication of this quality in society is the fear to express any opinion which would indicate a religious or political faith, or indeed independent thought upon anything. There is, therefore, an unreality, an untruthfulness in the upper middle-class Catholic society, which continually misleads statesmen to the great injury of the country.

The position and emoluments of a judge in a city like Dublin, where there is no resident aristocracy, necessarily give the Bar the first position in Irish society. The centralization of the legal business in the superior courts, by bringing the whole practising bar together, contributes to make barristers an influential element in Dublin society. They, in fact, are the generators of nearly all that commonly passes in society as the cultivated opinion of Dublin, and consequently in Ireland. For not only metropolitan opinions spread through the country by the intercourse of the gentry, professional men, and merchants with the capital; but the barristers themselves herald their opinions through the country when they go circuit or act as county judges.

Catholic judges and barristers form a large and influential element of our legal society; and if lawyers as a whole occupy the first intellectual position in society, how much greater influence, comparatively, must Catholic lawyers exert on the formation of opinion in Catholic society. We have seen that the majority of Catholic barristers have been educated in Trinity College. The education which a Catholic could receive there, is not likely to develope those higher qualities in which our new society is so deficient. I have already stated that Trinity College could not perform the functions of an educational brain for our intermediate education.

It is, if possible, still less adapted to perform the function of intellectual centre for Catholic society. Is the intellectual life which it transmits to Catholic society through its Catholic students, in harmony with the moral and religious constitution of that society? It could not be. The Catholic student of Trinity College is an intellectual pauper, admitted by sufferance to its halls. He is offered the mental food prepared for its true students, whose constitution it suits, whose minds thrive upon it, and who become self-reliant men, whose opinions, even when prejudiced, are their own. But how can he assimilate what must be unsuited for his constitution? The tone of the place is not only Protestant, but its moral and intellectual atmosphere is pervaded by a spirit of ascendancy, which must be eminently disagreeable to high-minded Catholic gentlemen. Catholics may, and as a matter of fact do, pass through it without loss of faith; but with this I do not concern myself. I only refer to the moral and intellectual action of the place, which I believe to be good upon Protestants, but which fundamentally changes the mode of thought of the Catholic student. An Irish conservative paper, in discussing the question of University Education, once put forward as one of the great claims of Trinity College to the gratitude of true Protestants, the subtle modification of Catholic mind subjected to its influence. I do not object to intellectual influence upon men's minds; it is one of the most important agents of education, and Universities are among its best instruments. But, in order that its action may be healthy and invigorating, should it not be untrammelled? Are the positions of the Protestant and Catholic students of Trinity College, in respect to the intellectual influence of their teachers, alike? The one can accept all their teaching unreservedly; the other can only accept one part timidly, while he must forego another part. His early ideas must be in perpetual conflict with his later teaching, and instead of developing his mind according to its natural law of evolution, and boldly discussing the problems of philosophy, he becomes suspicious of their tendency and weakly sceptical, without having passed through the mental process which makes philosophical scepticism at least honest; he loses enthusiasm for intellectual truth, for his mind has never enjoyed the liberty through which alone it can be recognized. This is the typical *pseudomorphic* Englishman: his mind has the outward

form of the mould of the natural man, but the internal structure is wanting.

The issue of a new society which has risen to wealth amidst the misery and discontent of the majority of their co-religionists, and educated in an atmosphere to which they could only become acclimatized by the sacrifice of their intellectual individuality, Catholic lawyers cannot be expected to judge of political questions according to rigid principles. They are therefore the fit representatives of a society whose only aim is "respectability". The present condition of things in Ireland being highly advantageous to the legal profession, any change will be sure to be considered injurious to it. The amount of legitimate legal business in Ireland being disproportionate to the number of barristers, places of all kinds are in great request. Besides the offices which legitimately belong to the legal profession, and which it is said amount to at least three for each five practising barristers, there is not an office, educational, financial, or administrative, that an Irish barrister may not aspire to, and as a matter of fact almost exclusively gets. Indeed, for a long time past the redress of Irish grievances has meant simply the bestowal of places upon lawyers.

The influence exerted by all these legitimate and illegitimate places upon the legal professions is marked by the production of a peculiar code of social ethics. Among those who aspire to "respectability", the chief qualification for any office is freedom from any strong belief in anything. To possess this quality is to be "liberal-minded" and "educated". The possession of a belief—but above all, its expression, however moderate—not only disqualifies in their opinion the unfortunate believer himself, but compromises all his friends. In order to prevent society, in its exclusive sense, from becoming tainted by so dreadful a disease as independent thought, it is called by some hard name, and every effort made to isolate it and stamp it out. As nothing contributes so much to "respectability" in Ireland, and indeed I suppose everywhere, as place, it is easy to understand how the selfish and material opinions of a few "liberal-minded" and "educated" lawyers should pass current for the real, honest, spontaneous opinion of so peculiarly circumstanced a society as that of the wealthier Catholics of Ireland.

To the majority of wealthy Catholics, University education

has not until lately presented itself as a question of pressing practical importance. Not having received an academical education themselves, they neither understand the true function of an University, nor appreciate the importance of the education it affords. It has been the custom to send the young men intended for the bar to Trinity College; they continue to do so still, not because they have discussed the education question, and decided in favour of united education, but because it is considered "respectable" in the case of a barrister, and it does not concern any body else. But ask the same men who send their sons to a Protestant University, or even the men who have been educated there themselves, to send their sons to an intermediate school conducted on the same principles, and they will refuse. University education has hitherto been a purely theoretical question, upon which many of the higher class of Catholics have been satisfied to accept the opinion of the lawyers. That opinion is intelligible enough, and would express itself as follows:—"The Queen's Colleges are state institutions in accordance with modern principles, where young men of various religious denominations, by mutual attrition, rub off the asperities of belief. It would be narrow-mindedness to think that they are not excellent institutions, and perfectly well suited to the circumstances of Ireland". Intermediate schools are, however, different things; they concern themselves directly. Accordingly, whereas they do not send their sons to the Queen's Colleges, they do send them to the Jesuits' and other clerical schools; even the greatest partizans of the Colleges in theory, send their sons to such schools. The middle, or primary education, does not concern the few persons who, as I have described, generate what passes for educated lay Catholic opinion. These persons would prefer that it remained as it is; not because they consider the present system good in itself, for they have not thought upon it at all, but because they consider the question an awkward one. But it is otherwise with University education: about that they feel keenly. They feel that the present system, so advantageous to them, would soon end, if Catholic youth had an opportunity of giving free scope to their natural genius, unfettered by the distrust of Trinity College teaching on the one hand, and on the other by that peculiar invention, intended only for Ireland, called "mutual concession", and which consists in sup-

pressing the higher aspirations after truth, through fear of wounding a sensitive neighbour. Mr. Whittle unconsciously exhibits this instinct of our social legislators, when he says: "But if free University education is preserved to us, that is, *if there be established no model clerical institution* into which Roman Catholics may be driven by an extreme exercise of Church authority, throwing the lower classes more completely into clerical hands will do *us no irreparable mischief*" (p. 37). The Italics are the author's.

I have already remarked that the unreality of this upper Catholic society misleads statesmen. They take this pseudo-Catholic opinion as the real opinion of the country, because it is the only one with which they come into contact. When the present Sir Robert Peel came to Ireland—anxious, as I believe he was, to earn some popularity by doing some work which he thought would benefit the country—he must have heard the hum of the "dissentient" Catholics about him, announcing to him that he had only to appeal to the educated classes of the country, and he would get such an expression of opinion as would crush the growing "ultramontanism" for ever. Sir Robert, believing that the establishment of the Queen's Colleges was a great benefit conferred by his father on Ireland, bethought him of using them as a test of Irish public opinion. With this view he very generously offered to found for ten years, three scholarships, of the value of £40 each, to be held each for one year. This offer was of course gladly accepted, as it really deserved to be, by the Senate of the Queen's University; and the example thus set, was followed, as it was intended to be, by a movement to raise subscriptions for the endowment of other scholarships. This surely was a favourable opportunity for the "dissentient" Catholic element to show forth its real strength, and confirm the prevalent idea that all educated Catholic opinion was in favour of "united" education—a happy phrase which some cunning man invented to express the true condition of the Queen's Colleges—students of different religions united under teachers belonging to one. The committee formed to carry on this movement, consisted of Sir Robert Peel, chairman, the Duke of Leinster, Right Hon. Abraham Brewster, Sir James Emerson Tennent, James Naper, Alexander Thom, Benjamin Lee Guinness, William Malcolmson, and George J. Stoney (Secretary of the Queen's University), Secretary.

On this committee there is not the name of a single Catholic; not a representative of that "dissentient" element, anxious to prove his independence of all sectarian prejudices. The address issued by the committee was, one would suppose, well suited to elicit the support of that numerous class of Catholic "dissenters" and opponents of "ultramontanism", which we are told exists in Ireland. Here are a few sentences:

"Founded by Parliament from a foresight of the great good they are destined to confer, they have won their way into popular esteem; their prestige is established, and the Irish people have recognized the claim of this University to take rank among the national institutions of the country. It is essential, however, to limit, as much as possible, the weight of government influence in the administration of such educational establishments, by restricting their burden on the public purse.

"We believe, therefore, that by appealing to the public spirit of the country, we appeal to motives as commendable and powerful as any which prompted the liberality of our forefathers.

"They fought the battle of that freedom which we enjoy; on us devolves the duty of shrinking from no sacrifice to strengthen and confirm it; and as to the influence of our example is entrusted the development of those moral and material resources which tend to elevate the character of our country, so we are persuaded that in no way can that development be more effectually promoted, than by enlarging the resources of this great national edifice of education, which, free from all denominational bias, is so successfully cultivating friendly feelings and mutual forbearance between the members of different creeds".

This appeal realized £8,749, besides £125 a-year during the life of the donors, or until further notice. So far as the fund to be raised was concerned, the project was successful; but no matter how peculiar the views of a person may be as to what the term "Irish people" should mean, it could hardly be maintained that the subscription list proves their recognition of the object. About one-half of it was subscribed by English noblemen and gentlemen, either wholly unconnected with Ireland, or permanent absentees, English officials in Ireland, professors and officers in the Queen's Colleges and other government schools, Irish subordinate officials, and a few Protestant clergymen. As regards its real object, the eliciting Catholic opinion and support in favour of the

Queen's Colleges, it was not only a failure, but brought forth one of the most remarkable protests which ever emanated from the Irish Catholics, and in which more than two hundred peers, members of parliament, magistrates, etc., joined. The "liberality of our forefathers" suggested to Catholics the charter schools and the premiums for the discovery of Popish schoolmasters; and the "battles of freedom they fought", the long struggle of ascendancy and hate which has exhausted the energies of Ireland; and accordingly very few Catholics subscribed. The total Catholic subscriptions contributed—subscribed by forty-two individuals, amounted to £382 5s. and £15 a-year during the life of the donors, of which £170 5s. was subscribed by ten Catholic officials; and even of this small sum £145 came from six professors and officers of the Queen's Colleges, leaving the munificent sum of £25 5s. as the total subscription of all the Catholic officials of Ireland, not directly connected with the Queen's Colleges. Of the small sum of £212 and £15 a-year, representing the contributions of all the non-official Catholics of Ireland, a portion was subscribed anonymously, and may, for aught I know, be an official subscription, and the larger portion by persons whose motives might not be uninfluenced by some of those agreeable favours it is in the power of a government to bestow, such as a high-sheriffship. The same year in which this subscription was raised, the Catholics contributed to the Catholic University of Ireland, £8,677, besides £200 per annum, for ten years, raised by the Catholics of the county and city of Limerick, and the munificent subscription of the late John Conolly, Esq., of £100 per annum for ten years to found scholarships therein, as answers to Sir R. Peel's challenge. And now again, that a few persons ambitious of public admiration for their independence of priestly influence, maintain that the Catholics of Ireland accept the Queen's Colleges in their present condition as a satisfactory settlement of their claims on the score of University education, I have no doubt they will again show, as they showed Sir Robert Peel, that they do not so accept them; and that, while they may not be willing to give exclusive power to the Catholic clergy in lay education, they are still more unwilling to leave to Protestants the monopoly of the education of Catholics.

We can now understand how an University embodying the

ideas of a Newman was in advance of Catholic lay opinion. It was equally in advance of much of the Catholic clerical opinion of the country. Neither the laity nor the clergy, generally speaking, understood its functions, or felt strongly enough how sadly both stood in need of it. Many priests made two mistakes regarding it, which, considering our peculiar circumstances, were natural. The first was by not recognizing the fundamental distinction between lay and ecclesiastical education. By education, I do not mean merely the knowledge communicated; for, so far as secular knowledge is concerned, the priest ought to know as much as the layman. I go further, and say that there is no branch of human knowledge which a priest might not find at some time useful to him; and one of the most important functions of a Catholic University would naturally be, in time, to give that knowledge to them, preliminary to their entering the regular theological colleges. What I do mean, is rather the training of the mind and the discipline. The distinction to which I allude, and which exists at all the educational stages, is more decided and more necessary at the University, or academical stage, than at any other period. The discipline which may produce a good priest, produces, in general, a layman wanting in those qualities which are so necessary for public life.

The second mistake was the inability to distinguish between a collegiate school and an University. This mistake they made in common with many Catholic laymen, who, no matter how wealthy, consider that the education of a youth is completed if he remains an additional year or two at a collegiate school. This misconception of the office and work of Universities has existed to such a degree, that I have heard clergymen speak of the rivalry between the Catholic schools and the Catholic University! The affiliation of schools to such an institution as the London University multiplies and aggravates the evil results of this serious educational error. A knowledge of a certain amount of Greek, Latin, French, mathematics, physical science, and other subjects, is not a sufficient test of education in a true sense. A school cannot possibly fulfil the functions of an University, or do its work; the more effective a school is as such, the more unfit it is as a place for University students. The converse of this is also true; to teach the rudiments of knowledge is not the work of

an University. The discipline of a school is intended for boys; the discipline of the University should be suited for youth about to assume the responsibility of manhood. The late case of Fitzgerald *v.* Northcote is a pregnant illustration of this misconception and its inevitable consequences. A Catholic judge sends his sons to the college, or rather collegiate school of Oscott. One of them having arrived at an age when, under normal circumstances, he should have passed to an University, and having declined to go to the Protestant University of Dublin, was entered as a student of the University of London, to which the college is affiliated. In this college, intended for boys, the university student remained, necessarily subject, at least in principle, to the discipline intended for boys. He committed a silly indiscretion, which, at an University, would have been simply punished by the contempt of his more generous fellow-students, if, indeed, he could have at all committed it there. At Oscott it was undoubtedly a grave offence against the discipline of the school, and he was accordingly subjected to the very severe punishment of expulsion. The judge and the college authorities were both to blame. The one ought to have known that a school was not the place to prepare a young man for public life; the others ought to have seen the impropriety of keeping an university student, who, though in theory subject to school discipline, could not in practice be made amenable to it. Indeed, Dr. Northcote's letters prove that he felt he should not have allowed him to remain there. One good has resulted from this trial. It has shown the absurdity of endeavouring to transform schools into university colleges, by affiliating them to the London University. I hope it will do the further good of directing the attention of lay Catholics to their true educational wants. And yet this is the system which is gravely stated to be open to Catholics, by those who wish to preserve for themselves a monopoly of the benefits of real collegiate education.

I now come to the special arguments which have been urged against the proposed modifications in the existing University arrangements in Ireland, and therefore against the existence of a Catholic University. They may be divided into two categories. The first embraces the statements, that all the Catholics who require University education get it under the

existing arrangements, and that consequently there can be no class deprived of the advantages of degrees owing to conscientious scruples; and that in any case, the lay Catholics of Ireland have already pronounced in favour of "united" education. The second embraces the wide subject of "Ultramontanism".

Professor Cairnes states the first argument thus:—

"It would seem, then, that the 'gap' in University education in Ireland has yet to be discovered: in plain terms, there is not a tittle of evidence to show that any appreciable proportion of Irish Roman Catholics are by conscientious objections, or by any other cause than their social position and circumstances, excluded from the existing Irish Universities" (p. 18).

He also goes into some calculations to disprove some of the statements made by The O'Donoghue when bringing forward his motion regarding the Catholic University before the House of Commons.

On reading this part of the professor's pamphlet, I asked myself, wherefore did he write it? Has he not answered himself? If there be no Catholics deprived of university education, and if Irish Catholics have accepted the Queen's Colleges, as we are confidently told they have, a Catholic University could not exist—even a royal charter and an endowment could not galvanize it. And if this be so, why is there so much hostility to an institution which has no elements of life, which is but a phantom created by the imagination of "ultramontanes"? What objection could there be to opening the doors of the Queen's University to hypothetical Catholic students, who could never be embodied in living forms? The deputation of the General Assembly of Ulster Presbyterians do not, however, appear to believe that the Catholics are quite satisfied with the present state of things, for they told the Lord Lieutenant that the Catholic students would be withdrawn from the Queen's Colleges, if the Catholic University were to be recognized by the State. His Excellency at once took advantage of their *naïveté*, for he told them if that were so, it would be the strongest argument in favour of recognizing it. Mr. Whittle says:

"His Excellency forgot that this withdrawal would be caused not by the wishes of the Catholic body, but by unscrupulous clerical pressure" (p. 37, note).

But Professor Cairnes tells us that this pressure has already commenced.

"The Queen's Colleges have succeeded not merely against the legitimate rivalry of an institution founded on different principles, but—a cardinal fact in this controversy—against the illegitimate and tyrannical opposition of a priesthood, who have refused to leave the decision to the unbiassed judgment of those whom the question concerned,—against an opposition availing itself of all the arts at its command, for inspiring superstitious terror, of denunciation from the altar, exclusion from sacraments, in a word, of expedients resembling rather the spiritual appliances of Jesuit despots dictating to Paraguayan savages, than remonstrances fitted to be addressed to reasonable and civilized men. For example, every Roman Catholic entering a Queen's College does so under a fire of this kind" (p. 17).

He then quotes a passage from a pastoral of Dr. Derry, interdicting persons of his diocese from going to a Queen's College. If the unscrupulous pressure will withdraw students after the Catholic University shall have been affiliated to the Queen's University, why has it not done so already? or does the desire for a degree outweigh the terror of episcopal wrath? What his Excellency really did forget on the occasion in question, was to remind the Belfast deputation that the loss of the six Catholic students who entered the Belfast college in 1864–65, out of a total of 135 entrances, could not be such a serious matter; unless indeed that it would remove the "united" cloak, and allow the public to see the true Presbyterian character of that institution beneath.

The best friend of the Queen's Colleges, Sir Robert Peel himself, was so far from believing in Professor Cairnes's theory, that all the Catholics who could possibly want University education, have their wants already supplied, that he attempted to found a fourth Queen's College in Dublin, chiefly to supply their wants. At the public meeting of the Queen's University, held in Dublin Castle, on October 11th, 1861, Sir Robert Peel said:

"We find that three provinces, Ulster, Munster, and Connaught, have each of them a college—Belfast, Cork, and Galway; and what do we learn? I have been looking at the rolls of these colleges, and I find their educational influences are almost entirely limited to the immediate districts in which they are situated; so that while we have Ulster, Munster, and Connaught

provided with collegiate education, we find the metropolitan province of Leinster, and the capital city of Ireland, entirely unprovided with those academic advantages which the youth of Ireland justly and properly claim. This should not be so. We should not have the metropolitan province of Leinster, and the richest city in Ireland, uniting within its limits a more influential Roman Catholic community than I believe is to be found in any other of the three provinces, and also a most important body of the Wesleyan communion, entirely deprived, as the rolls of these colleges show, of the advantages of academical instruction afforded by these institutions".

What will Mr. Cairnes say to this flat contradiction of his denial, that Catholics were debarred by *any cause* from obtaining a degree? Surely he must admit that Sir Robert Peel has proved that there is not only a "gap", but a much more important gap than any filled by the existing Queen's Colleges. The following table represents this "gap" in a comparative form:

Name of Province.	Total population in 1861.	Number of Catholics.	Total No. of students attending provincial Q. College.	No. of Catholic students.	No. of entrances of students in 1864-65.	No. of Catholics entering in 1864-65.
Ulster,	1,914,236	966,613	405	22	135	6
Connaught,	913,135	866,023	169	78	70	28
Munster,	1,513,558	1,420,076	263	129	83	39
Leinster,	1,455,635	1,252,553	—	[113]	—	—

If we assume that the number of Catholics in the Queen's College, Cork, represents the total number of Catholic youths in the province of Munster who require academical education, and that the Catholics of the province of Leinster require academical instruction only in the same relative proportion; then a Queen's College in Dublin ought to have at least 113 Catholic students, as I have indicated in the table by the number enclosed within brackets. Sir Robert assures us that these Catholics are "*entirely deprived* of academical instruction". Any one at all acquainted with Leinster, and especially with Dublin, knows that this estimated number ought, in truth, to be doubled, in order to express the relative ability, proportionate to population, of Leinster Catholics to pay for academical education.

Again, will Professor Cairnes maintain that the twenty-two

Catholic students attending Queen's College, Belfast, or the six students who entered last year, represent the total number of academical students which the 966,000 Ulster Catholics ought to give? Why, if that province furnished students in the same proportion as the Catholics of Munster, there ought to have been at least eighty-seven Catholic students at Belfast, and instead of six entrances, there ought to have been at least twenty-nine, representing a residence of three years at the College. Even if it furnished students in proportion to poor Connaught, it ought to have at least eighty-five students. But the Ulster Catholics know the true character of Queen's College, Belfast, and therefore keep aloof from it.

The advocates of the present system of the Queen's Colleges are never tired of announcing that the proportion of Catholics who attend them, is just what it ought to be, in proportion to the wealth of Catholics. And yet, I have just shown, that if we judge of that proportion by Munster and Connaught, there is a gap of 178 Catholic students still unprovided for, a number equal to 77·7 per cent. of the whole number of Catholics attending the three Queen's Colleges in 1864-1865. If Professor Cairnes be right, that the country has pronounced in favour of the present system of the Colleges, the government is bound in justice to the Catholics of Leinster, to establish a fourth Queen's College in Dublin. But even the establishment of a fourth Queen's College would not provide for the gap of 65 students, which I have shown to exist in Ulster.

Professor Cairnes tells us that Catholics form only thirty-three per cent. of the aggregate of 6,483 members of the learned professions in Ireland; twenty-four per cent. of the magistracy, and twenty-seven per cent. of the "ladies and gentlemen". While admitting that these data do not afford an accurate measure of the comparative need amongst Catholics for University Education, he nevertheless believes that they furnish an approximate standard, which, taken in connection with the statistics of higher education, on which I shall have something to say presently, justifies him in thinking that Catholics are not badly provided for already. Now, suppose we test by this standard his theory, that there is no gap in Catholic education to be filled in, taking as our unit the proportion between Presbyterian members of the learned professions, and the number of the students which they fur-

nish to the Queen's Colleges. According to the census of 1861, the number of Catholics belonging to the learned professions, exclusive of the clergy, was 2,219, and the number of Presbyterians, 423. If in 1864-65, the number of Catholics attending the three Queen's Colleges bore only the same ratio to the number of Catholics in the learned professions, which the number of Presbyterian students does to the number of Presbyterian members of the learned professions, we should have 1,689 Catholics at least on the rolls of the Queen's Colleges at this moment. If we take into account landed proprietors, wealthy merchants, etc., the proportion would be still greater.

Professor Cairnes will endeavour to explain this still greater "gap", by telling us that the Presbyterian clergy are educated at Belfast, while the Catholic clergy are educated at Maynooth. Well, let us add not only the ecclesiastical students of Maynooth, but also of the Missionary College of All Hallows, making together 731, and the 100 Catholic students, who Mr. Whittle says are at Trinity College, Dublin, and the 229 Catholics at the Queen's Colleges; and still we have only 1060, leaving a "gap" of 629 to be filled up before we would be on an equality with the Presbyterians.

But I object altogether to including the students of Maynooth, because that college is a special school; and if the education of Catholics were organized as it ought to be, and as I hope it one day will be, a large proportion of Catholic ecclesiastical students would receive an academical education before entering Maynooth or any other special theological college. Why should not the Catholic clergy enjoy the same advantages that the clergy of the Established Church and the properly educated physicians and barristers possess, and which Queen's College, Belfast, now affords to the Presbyterian clergy, before entering upon the studies of their special schools? At present a large portion of the ecclesiastical student's time is spent in a preliminary and necessarily very inadequate study of some of the subjects of an ordinary academical arts' course, which would be better acquired at an University. Independently of the advantage resulting to lay Catholic society, and to intermediate and primary education, of having a highly educated class of ecclesiastical students, the theological studies of the college of Maynooth could be enlarged, and more time devoted to ecclesiastical history, oriental languages, exegesis, and other subjects.

If we take the relative number of males of different religions attending what are called superior schools and collegiate schools, as our standard for determining the proportionate ability of the members of each religious denomination to bear the expense of academical education, we shall find that the results do *not* support Professor Cairnes's theory of our educational wants. The following table shows the number of pupils attending superior schools and collegiate schools in 1861:*

Religious Denominations.	Number in Province of				Total in Ireland.	Per centage of each Denomination for all Ireland.
	Leinster	Munster	Ulster	Connaught		
Catholics	2,859	2,052	742	590	6,243	47.167
Church of England ...	2,751	1,044	996	211	5,002	37.791
Presbyterians ...	180	60	967	42	1,249	9.436
Other denominations	345	170	187	40	742	5.606
Total, ...	6,135	3,326	2,892	883	13,236	100.000

I think every candid person will admit that the position of Catholics in respect of University education does not bear any relation to their position as regards intermediate education, as shown by the foregoing table. Professor Cairnes will admit, I am sure, that the Catholics, as regards wealth and social position and educational wants, are at least on a level with the Presbyterians. If, then, Catholic students of universities bore to the pupils of the intermediate schools the same ratio that the Presbyterian students of the Queen's Colleges do to the Presbyterian pupils of intermediate schools, 1,609 Catholics should be on the rolls of some University. Even if we take Professor Cairnes's own number 1,155 as the total number of Catholics receiving education of University rank, a number which includes the students of Maynooth and other ecclesiastical colleges, and even *diocesan*

* It is almost impossible to compile accurate educational statistics from the Census reports. Thus the University of Dublin is put down as having 132 students! Again, under the head of colleges are put the Queen's College, Cork, the Diocesan Seminary of Clonliffe, near Dublin, St. John's College, Waterford, and Maynooth, which certainly do not belong to the same category. The numbers in the table include all pupils and students, whether ecclesiastical or otherwise, in all superior schools and colleges, except the University of Dublin, the Catholic University, the Queen's Colleges, Maynooth, and All Hallows. All the other colleges are *high schools*, and not university colleges.

seminaries, there will still be a "gap" of 454 students which we ought to have in order to be merely on a level with the Presbyterians.

There is another feature of Irish intermediate education, which illustrates, as I think, the existence of this "gap", which Professor Cairnes is so anxious to prove does not exist. The following table contains the number of pupils of different religious denominations in superior schools and colleges in 1861, of the age of fifteen years and upwards:

Religious Denominations.	Number in Province of				Total in Ireland.	Per-centage of each Religious Denomination.
	Leinster	Munster	Ulster.	Connaught.		
Catholics	1,090	912	411	208	2,621	57.986
Church of England...	721	256	275	78	1,330	29.424
Presbyterians ...	22	2	263	11	298	6.442
All others	—	—	—	—	271	6.148
Total, ...	...	...	...	...	4,520	100.000

It is quite evident from this table that Catholic boys are allowed to remain at the collegiate schools at an age when, under favourable circumstances, they should be at an university. In other words, the better class of collegiate schools attempt to perform the functions of university colleges to a very considerable extent, as was illustrated in the case already mentioned of Fitzgerald *v.* Northcote.

Several other conclusions may also be deduced from the preceding tables. In the first place, it is apparent that Catholics are more disposed to give a higher education to their children in proportion to their wealth, than any other class; that in fact the law of the majority is beginning to tell in the higher, as in the lower education. Secondly, that as regards higher education, so far as the census can be trusted, enlightened Ulster is behind both Munster and Leinster, while the Presbyterians, though nearly as numerous as the members of the Church of England,* have, notwithstanding all the favours bestowed upon them, less than one-fourth the number of pupils receiving education

* The members of the Church of England form 11.9 per cent , and the Presbyterians 9 per cent. of the population of Ireland. The "important body of the Wesleyan communion" mentioned by Sir R. Peel forms 0.8 per cent.!

at superior schools that the latter have. The fact is, the Presbyterians use the national schools, and especially the model schools, as superior schools. Like their co-religionists, the Scotch, they have made the most of the public grants for education; and while the Catholics have been fighting the battles of civil and religious liberty, not only for themselves but for the Dissenters, the Presbyterians, who have always done their utmost to retard the progress and freedom they talk so much about, have seized the prize and made it their own. This is the real secret of the Presbyterian fervour for unsectarian education. I give them credit for good sense, in having made the most of the opportunity; but a little less selfishness, and more honesty and candour, would be great improvements in their education. Thirdly, the concentration of pupils in Leinster shows either the greater ability to pay for superior education, or a greater appreciation of its advantages by the Leinster people, or that many pupils of the other provinces are sent to schools and colleges in Leinster. The latter is certainly true of the Catholics, but there can also be no doubt that there is a greater relative ability on the part of Leinster Catholics to pay for education. This circumstance shows how great a gap was left when the Queen's Colleges were established, and fully bears out the views of Sir Robert Peel as to the importance of that gap and the necessity there is for filling it up. The concentration of pupils in Leinster Colleges also does away with the argument that Catholics cannot afford to pay for sending their sons to an University at a distance. It shows to what straits the opponents of Irish Catholics are put, when they use an argument which would be equally fatal to the Queen's Colleges.

Although, as I have above shown, the want of university education for Catholics may be proved by statistical arguments, I do not admit that the question of the higher education of a people should depend solely upon the greater or lesser number of those who may require it. I do not think that there can ever be too much education in a country, and I will never consent to measure the intellectual wants of Irish Catholics by the length of their purses. Why should not the peasant lads of Ireland come "from the hill sides where they had tended sheep, or from the strath, where they had guided the plough", to an Irish University, and "return home

for the summer, to tend sheep upon the hills, or guide the plough in the valley, with some remnants of the twelve pounds in a retentive pocket, and much of varied and valuable knowledge in a more retentive brain"? as Professor Thompson of Galway tells us the Scottish lads do, who frequent the University of Aberdeen. Have the Presbyterians alone the right to unlimited education, while the Irish Catholics must only take it in proportion to their wealth?

Here is the proper place to notice a feature of the Queen's Colleges, which has been brought into relief by the action of the Queen's University, and which was pointed out, if I recollect rightly, by The O'Donoghue, but which Professor Cairnes and others have carefully avoided noticing, while they are very triumphant in pointing out his *supposed* errors respecting the position of Catholic education. The number of Catholic students at the Queen's Colleges is carefully noted, but the religion of the graduates of the University is not given. Perhaps the following tables may suggest an explanation. I have classified the degrees into two categories—academical degrees proper, which are the true tests of the educational action of the colleges, and professional degrees. To the first belong the degrees of B.A. and M.A.; to the latter those of LL.B., LL.D., M.D., and the diplomas of elementary law, engineering, and agriculture.* Each table contains the number of degrees granted in 1864, the last return I have been able to find, and a summary of the four years ending in 1864.

Academical Degrees.

Queen's College.	Number of degrees granted in 1864.		Total number of degrees in the four years ending 1864.	
	M. A.	B. A.	M. A.	B. A.
Belfast ...	9	42½†	30	115
Cork ...	1	8	9½	38½
Galway ...	1	3½	5½	37½
	11	54	45	191

* The agricultural chairs are, I believe to be abolished, and no classes are now formed in that subject.

† The same student is frequently returned for two of the colleges; not being able to assign such a student to the college to which he properly belongs, I have been obliged to divide his degree.

Professional Degrees.

Queen's College.	Number of degrees granted in 1864.			Number of degrees granted in the four years ending 1864.			
	Law.	Medicine.	Engineering.	Law.	Medicine.	Engineering.	Agriculture.
Belfast ...	1½	12½	3	4½	37	7	—
Cork ...	—	15	5	3	51	17	2
Galway ...	1½	10½	3	5½	41	6	—
	3	38	11	13	129	30	2

If we add together the degrees of each class, and represent each total by 100, the following will be the per-centage in which each Queen's College contributed graduates of the two categories to the Queen's University:—

		Belfast.	Cork.	Galway.
Academical Graduates ...	1864	79.231 ...	13.846 ...	6.923
	4 years ending 1864 ...	61.440 ...	20.339 ...	18.221
Professional Graduates ...	1864	32.692 ...	38.462 ...	28.846
	4 years ending 1864 ...	27.873 ...	41.954 ...	30.173

It is needless to remark that, since the great majority of academical graduates come from Belfast, there must be very few Catholics among them. Even of those who come from Cork and Galway, comparatively few are Catholics, as any one at all acquainted with the south or west of Ireland may see, on reading over the lists of names given in the reports of the Queen's University. On the other hand, a fair share of the professional degrees, especially of the medical ones, are taken by Catholics. I think an analysis of the Catholic students of the Queen's Colleges would show that they belong chiefly to two classes:—

1. Those who attend their medical schools, as they would attend any private medical school, quite irrespective of its connection with the colleges; and

2. Students from the immediate neighbourhood, who use the colleges rather as high schools than as University Colleges, and very few of whom belong to the upper class of Catholics.

It would be a great mistake to argue that Irish Catholics have accepted the existing system of the Queen's Colleges, because a large number of Catholic medical students fre-

quent them. In the first place, the part of the teaching in them, which is least objectionable on Catholic grounds, must be the professional; secondly, there was always a local medical school in Cork, attended by students of all religious denominations, which was extinguished by the far better college school, and to this consequently a great number of local students go; and thirdly, a certain number of medical students go to them from other places, especially to Queen's College, Galway, for a single session, in order to comply with the University regulation, which requires an attendance during one session at one of the Queen's Colleges, to qualify for the degree of doctor of medicine. For instance, I recognize, on casually looking over the rolls of the Catholic University School of Medicine for the last few years, the names of at least sixteen or seventeen students, and there may be several others, who have been in this way, for some time, at one or other of the Queen's Colleges, and who have either graduated already, or propose to graduate in the Queen's University. In many instances I have been myself consulted by medical students upon the propriety of going to Queen's College, Galway or Cork, for six months; and as I could not, taking all the circumstances into account, fairly ask a student to forego the advantage of a degree in medicine, I have invariably told them to do so.

Professor Cairnes, after having, as he believed, conclusively proved by statistics that there is no gap in University education in Ireland to be filled up, and demolishing a curious objection to the Queen's Colleges, put forward by Mr. O'Reilly, M.P., that they engendered the ambition of becoming placemen in the students, says:—

"To the argument in the position to which it has now been brought, there is but one objection which we can imagine a candid opponent of the Queen's Colleges to advance—the suggestion that—though the Queen's Colleges, have, in fact, succeeded, they have succeeded only as a *dernier ressort;* that the Roman Catholics have gone to them because they desired University education, and had no other means of obtaining it. But unfortunately for the case of the Ultramontanes, they have, by the establishment of the model institution, effectually estopped themselves from this reply. It can scarcely be said that the Queen's Colleges are a *dernier ressort*, while there is the alternative for students which the institution offers. If the Roman Ca-

tholics entertain conscientious objections to the Queen's Colleges, is there not abundant room for them in the Catholic University'? We shall be told 'The Catholic University' has not a charter, which is true; but if 'The Catholic University' cannot confer degrees on its *alumni*, London University can, and does".

While I would be fully entitled to found my arguments in favour of a Catholic University upon the sole ground that certain persons entertained conscientious scruples against mixed or Protestant Colleges, I have been able to prove the necessity of its existence upon still wider grounds. But, as Professor Cairnes seems to think that the student who has those scruples has no ground of complaint, because he need not go to a Queen's College as a *dernier ressort*, I think it right to direct his attention to the fact above mentioned, where undoubtedly his particular college was had recourse to as a *dernier ressort*. As to his proposed alternative, of affiliating the Catholic University to the London University, we do not share Mr. O'Reilly's enthusiasm for that institution; and I am much mistaken if there be half a dozen educated Catholics in Ireland who agree with Mr. O'Reilly and Sir Dominic Corrigan about the principle upon which that institution is founded. At all events, no English statesman could venture to propose to Irish Catholics to affiliate the Catholic University to an institution, in which they would be wholly unrepresented, and upon the management of which they could exert no influence.

I now come to "Ultramontanism"—one of those handy words which float about in society in search of an idea, to which to attach itself. It is a term frequently applied by the same person to principles the most opposite, because it offers an excellent substitute for argument. "Ultramontanism" means simply the principle of the freedom of the Church from state control, as opposed to Gallicanism, or the subjection of the Church to the State. Under this definition may be, and actually are, included, persons holding the most opposite views about almost every question. On the one hand there are persons to whom the term "Ultramontanes" is applicable, who hold very extreme views upon religious questions, lying without, though often intimately connected with, the dogmas of the Church, and who in carrying out their principles logically to their extreme conclusions, propound the most start-

ling theories upon politics and allied subjects. Again, there are "Ultramontanes" who, while they believe that the Church should not be the slave of the State, also believe that civil government should in turn be perfectly independent of the Church; that the pursuit of knowledge, for its own sake, is one of the loftiest objects that can engage the human mind; that political liberty is a blessing; and that an honest expression of all these opinions is perfectly compatible with faith in the doctrines of the Church and the practice of its discipline, with a respect for the character of the ministers of religion, combined with a thorough independence of clerical dictation in matters not of faith.

Mr. Whittle and Professor Cairnes do not seem to be aware of this elementary distinction; the former, for instance, makes the *Dublin Review* the representative of "Ultramontanism" and the oracle of the whole Church,* except a very small "dissentient element", of which he, it would appear, wishes to be recognized as the representative. Under those circumstances, he finds it difficult how to dispose of such distinguished men as Dr. Newman and Montalembert, of such "reasonable minds" as Dr. Russell of Maynooth, and Dr. Moriarty, Bishop of Kerry, who are either the luminaries of "Ultramontanism", like the first two, or merely within its sphere, as if by accident, like the latter,—for he admits that they enunciate moderate views. The general character of the party Mr. Whittle thus describes:

* In all great bodies there will always be several parties, who, while they agree in essentials, differ in a great many points. If the House of Commons can afford to contain within it such men as Mr. Disraeli, Mr. Gladstone, and Mr. Bright, all equally anxious to maintain the constitution, and two of whom have represented that constitution in the councils of the sovereign, why should not the far greater body, the Catholic Church, also have parties? To suppose that that Church is only represented by the *Dublin Review*, would be the same as to take the *Quarterly Review*, or any other periodical, as the sole exponent of British opinion. An English Catholic Bishop, the Hon. and Right Rev. Dr. Clifford, recently in administering a deservedly severe rebuke to a Catholic gentleman who had arrogated to himself the right to speak for the whole Church, as Mr. Whittle has done for the "dissentient element" in it, has thus pointed out the true position of the *Dublin Review* as an organ of Catholic opinion:

"The writers in the *Dublin Review* are good and talented men, and they have devoted their talents to the service of the Church, but the views they advocate are worth just as much as the arguments with which they support them, and no more. If the subjects they treat are open questions, they remain open subjects after they have been treated, just as much as they were before".

"The reasoners I have referred to, ignore the following facts, that this [*i.e.*, a Charter for the Catholic University] is the demand, not of the Catholic laity, but of a clerical faction; that this faction professes tenets opposed to British law and civilization; that there exists within the Catholic body a dissentient element, which, and which alone, gives promise that that body will one day be fully qualified for the duties of British citizens; that it is for the purpose of crushing the dissentient element the bishops ask for a Catholic University" (p. 14).

The constituents of the "dissentient element" here referred to, as enumerated by Mr. Whittle, are rather curious. We have Dr. Döllinger, "a great Catholic theologian, the hope of the Church in our time" (p. 19); then yourself and others (among whom there was more than one professor of the Catholic University), who were connected with the *Home and Foreign Review*, which, he tells us, "was started in 1862 to represent that section of British Catholicism which rejected Ultramontanism" (p. 56). The next contribution to the "dissentient element" is mentioned in the following passage: "I need not dwell further on the existence of this dissentient element: every one who knows anything of Catholic society is aware of the fact. I may refer to one public proof of its existence in Ireland—the lecture delivered by Mr. Justice Keogh on Milton at the Afternoon Lectures in May, 1865". How well informed on the history of the Catholic University and on Ultramontanism Mr. Whittle is, may be judged by a few facts. The organizer and first rector of the University was Dr. Newman; among the earliest names of its associate members are M. de Montalembert, Dr. Döllinger, and yourself. So that these constituents of the "dissentient element", to which may be added more than one professor of the Catholic University itself, are actual members of the institution which was established to crush them!

Mr. Whittle's knowledge of the doctrines of the Church seems to be of the same logical character as that about the Catholic University. But, I forgot:—he leaves logic entirely to "Ultramontanes". Any one who is curious to know, not the extent of Mr. Whittle's "dissent", for that he could not tell himself, but his strange confusion of ideas upon the subjects about which he has undertaken to enlighten the public, will find a passage at p. 25 of his pamphlet, sufficient for

the purpose, though one cannot see what the matters there mentioned have to do with the question at issue.

But although I shall certainly leave Mr. Whittle's peculiar form of "dissent" unnoticed, I must point out some few of his many errors of fact. Professor Cairnes has fallen into the same errors; indeed, one finds them cropping up everywhere, as arguments against the changes proposed to be made by the government in the University arrangements in Ireland. Those which I shall deal with are: 1. Dr. Cullen's appointment as archbishop; 2. his office of apostolic delegate; 3. the Synod of Thurles.

Professor Cairnes, speaking of the singular circumstance that Dr. Cullen happens to be the successor of both Dr. Crolly and Dr. Murray, whom he claims as "enlightened supporters of the Colleges", says he was "appointed to the See of Armagh through a stretch of Papal authority, exercised in defiance of the immemorial usage of the Irish Church, according to which the *dignissimus* of those recommended for the honour by the clergy of the diocese is selected" (p. 7).

Mr. Whittle's version of this story is:

> "The manner of his election was significant. It had been the immemorial custom, on the death of a bishop, for the clergy of the diocese to meet and choose three names, arranged as *dignissimus*, *dignior*, *dignus*, to be sent to Rome for the Pope to select from among them to fill the vacant see" (p. 38).

Whatever may have been the custom of the ancient Irish Church, there cannot be the slightest doubt that the recommendation to vacant sees by the chapter and clergy of the diocese, though an occasional proceeding during the last three centuries, was not a general or even frequent custom; nor is there any proof that the candidate so recommended was always, or perhaps even generally, nominated by the Pope. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, when the diocesan and parochial organization was often interrupted by the persecutions, vacant sees were generally filled up, upon the petition of the metropolitan and suffragans, or of the archbishop or bishop who happened to have most influence at Rome at the time. It was only after the first instalment of emancipation was granted, at the end of the last century, that the question of domestic

nomination began to be discussed. It was proposed as a safeguard against the influence of the government in the nomination of the bishops, at a time when the question of the *Veto* occupied so much attention.

The "immemorial custom", in its existing form, was, in substance, first proposed by the Rev. Richard Hayes, a Franciscan friar, who was sent to Rome in 1815 as the delegate of the lay Catholics of Ireland, to oppose the concession to the British government of a Veto upon the appointment of the Irish bishops. His plan, which is an admirable one, and which may have been used in some dioceses before his time, was adopted in principle by the Propaganda; and Dr. Doyle was elected in accordance with it. But it was only in 1829 that it was finally settled by a decree of Propaganda. This decree expressly enacts that the proceedings of the diocesan clergy are *not* to be termed an election, a postulation, or nomination, but only a recommendation. It further obliges the bishops of the province in which the see is situated to put on record their judgment upon the qualifications of the three persons selected by the priests; and if they should consider the three priests named to be unqualified, the Pope is to provide for the see. And it explicitly declares that the Holy See is not to be in any way bound to elect any one of the three persons recommended.*

* The following extracts from this decree are added for the information of those who wish to see the original authority for my statements.

"Cum ad gravissimum Electionis Hiberniae Episcoporum negotium rite sancteque absolvendum, certam aliquam methodum ubique in eo regno servandam statuere in primis opportunum esse Sacra Congregatio intellexerit, qua fieret ut Sedes Apostolica *exploratam notitiam* habere possit meritorum Sacerdotum pro quibus commendationes afferuntur ut ad aliquem Hiberniae Episcopatum eligantur, etc. . . . . .

"Clara altaque voce a Scrutatoribus ad Praesidem, et a Praeside ad conventum, renuntianda sunt nomina trium eorum Sacerdotum, in quos major Suffragionem numerus convenerit. . . . . .

"Si Episcopi judicaverint tres illos commendatos minus dignos esse, quorum unus ad Episcopatum promoveatur, tunc quin detur novae commendationi locus Summus Pontifex pro sua sapientiâ, viduatae ecclesiae providebit. . . . . .

"Significari omnibus voluit, in documentis de hac re pertractantibus, ad Sanctam Sedem transmittendis, nihil inveniri debere quod electionem, postulationem, nominationem innuat, sed simplicem commendationem: memorata praeterea documenta esse debere jussit in forma supplicis libelli ita concepti, ut inde pateat nullam in Sanctam Sedem inferri obligationem eligendi unum ex commendatis. . . . . .

"Declaravit denique Sacra Congregatio salvam semper atque illaesam manere debere, Sedis Apostolicae libertatem in eligendis Episcopis, ita ut

On the death of Dr. Crolly, three names were sent, in accordance with the provisions of the brief just mentioned, to Rome. But it is a matter of notoriety that opinion was much divided about them, and that there was every reason to apprehend a most deplorable disunion, should any of the persons named be appointed archbishop. Under those circumstances, the Propaganda, to whom the state of things was made known by the Irish bishops, applied to the remaining archbishops for further information, and it was upon their suggestion that Dr. Cullen was appointed. One of those Archbishops was Dr. Murray, who, if he did not originate the suggestion, acquiesced in it. Dr. Cullen was not, as Mr. Whittle tells us, a monk, a friar, or a member of any religious order, but a secular priest. He was not in personal attendance upon the Pope, as Mr. Whittle further tells us. But he was rector of the Irish College, to which office he had been appointed at the age of twenty-eight, because of his reputation as a theologian and oriental scholar. He had also acted for upwards of seventeen years as the agent of the Irish bishops for ecclesiastical affairs, and not, as Professor Cairnes says, as director of the Irish department of the Papal government. There is no such office. Dr. Cullen's appointment was, therefore, not only in accordance with the brief of 1829, but with the far more usual custom of the last three centuries. And at all events, if his appointment was due to an "ultramontane" idea, that idea came not from Rome, but from Ireland. The predecessors of Dr. Cullen in his present see were not, we are told, "ultramontanes", because "ultramontanism" dates in Ireland —indeed everywhere—only from the year 1849, according to Mr. Whittle. But it may be useful for Professor Cairnes

commendationes lumen tantum et cognitionem Sacrae Congregationi nunquam tamen obligationem sint allaturae". . . . . *Decretum Sacrae Congregationis Generalis de Propagandâ Fide, habitae die primâ Junii, anno* 1829.

From these extracts it will be seen that the sole object of the proceedings of the diocesan clergy is expressly defined to be the furnishing information, which will enable the Pope to "become acquainted" with the merits of the clergymen who may be recommended as eligible to the vacant see. In the existing Irish ecclesiastical arrangements, the only authentic way in which this can be accomplished, is by the report of the diocesan clergy, or of the bishops of the neighbouring dioceses; and the better to secure an *explorata notitia*, the Propaganda requires that the information shall be furnished from both these sources. It is worthy of observation that the decree itself makes no mention of the classification of the names as *dignissimus*, *dignior*, and *dignus*.

to know that Dr. Troy is believed to have been nominated directly by the Pope, Bishop of Ossory, in 1776; that he was translated to Dublin in 1786, by the same direct action of the Pope; and that he himself recommended Dr. Murray, his successor, to be his coadjutor. It thus appears that, until Dr. Cullen's election by the clergy of the diocese of Dublin, the "immemorial custom" did not come into operation in Dublin. It may be further useful for Professor Cairnes to know, that our later ecclesiastical annals furnish many other instances in which the "immemorial custom" has not been observed, and nobody complained of the infraction. For instance, Dr. Delany was appointed Bishop of Cork in 1847, and Dr. Moriarty Bishop of Kerry in 1854, although neither was *dignissimus*. And yet these appointments have never been denounced—probably, not even by Professor Cairnes—as "an exercise of Papal authority in defiance of the immemorial usage of the Irish Church".

Professor Cairnes and Mr. Whittle are equally incorrect in their statement about Dr. Cullen's office of Apostolic Delegate. They seem not to know that the powers of a delegate depend upon the functions delegated. The former tells us that "it was indeed avowedly to advance the aims of ultramontane policy that he was sent to Ireland, the better to equip him for which service, he was furnished with the further authority and distinction of Apostolic Delegate" (p. 7). Mr. Whittle's version of this story is: "Archbishop Cullen ably availed himself of the crisis, and won so much popularity, that on the death of Dr. Murray in 1852, his name was sent to Rome as *dignissimus*, and he became Archbishop of Dublin. He was also appointed Papal Delegate, an office which gives him controlling power over the whole Church of Ireland. Since this period he has used his immense power unsparingly to promote the most extreme ultramontanism" (p. 39). Dr. Cullen was not appointed Apostolic Delegate in 1852 on account of his action concerning the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, as Mr. Whittle suggests; nor has he ever been appointed Apostolic Delegate simply. He was appointed on the 6th of April, 1850, in order that he might canonically convoke the Synod of Thurles, and for the causes which might arise out of the special legislation of that Synod; and he was so appointed because he was Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of all Ireland. In the capa-

city of Delegate, so far from having immense power, he has practically none. I may also add, that there are other apostolic delegates in Ireland besides Dr. Cullen—every bishop in Ireland has, in fact, certain powers delegated to him. As Professor Cairnes appears to pay great attention to the pastorals of the Catholic bishops of the province in which his College is situated, I cannot understand how he has not long since discovered the fact just mentioned.

Their statements about the Synod of Thurles betray, if possible, still greater ignorance. Professor Cairnes says, that one of the first acts of Dr. Cullen was "to summon a synod to Thurles for the express purpose of condemning" the Queen's Colleges. Mr. Whittle mentions the Synod of Thurles as one of the "singular acts" by which the Roman "court" manifests its conflict with modern opinion. A synod is a deliberative body, and its acts, like those of parliament, are passed by votes of the majority. Professor Cairnes tells us that the condemnation of the colleges was carried by a majority of one. How then could the synod have been summoned for the purpose of doing an act, the nature of which could not have been predicted when the synod was summoned, especially were Professor Cairnes's story of the "sick bishop" true? A few words on the history of that now famous synod may be useful.

The Irish bishops had been in the habit of holding an annual meeting, in autumn, in Dublin, for the purpose of considering and taking common action upon all matters which affected not only the spiritual but the physical welfare of their flocks; for, unfortunately, those who ought to be the guardians of the physical welfare of the Irish people, have singularly neglected their duties, when not themselves the agents of evil. These annual meetings, although gatherings of bishops, could not in strictness be called episcopal, or even ecclesiastical, assemblies. The resolutions were drawn up and passed as at ordinary meetings, and were usually published in the newspapers of the day, just as the conclusions of any other body of men upon questions of public interest. These meetings were not synods in the proper sense of the word; they were not convoked or presided over by any regularly constituted authority; their deliberations were not conducted with the canonical formalities; and it was more than problematical whe-

ther their decisions or injunctions could have any binding force as ecclesiastical ordinances. It is not unlikely, therefore, that, at the period to which I am now referring, many of the Irish bishops were beginning to feel the inconvenience of such a condition of things, just as their fellow-prelates, in the United States, in France and Germany, had been also led to reëstablish the ancient synodical meetings.

At their annual meeting, held on 6th November, 1849, and presided over by Dr. Murray, the bishops had under consideration what action should be taken in the case of the Queen's Colleges, which were then upon the eve of being opened. Since the passing of the act establishing them, they had formed a constant subject of discussion; some of the bishops were more or less in favour of giving them a trial; while another party were for immediate condemnation. The matter had, indeed, been referred to Rome, and, as is well known, two rescripts had been received from the Propaganda, condemning the principle of the colleges; but no final decision had as yet been come to in Ireland, as to the course to be adopted regarding them. But every one—layman as well as ecclesiastic—felt the advisability and great importance of devising at once some uniform line of conduct, which might be followed by all. However, at this meeting, the bishops unanimously resolved to reserve all action in the matter for the consideration of a national synod, to be held in June, 1850. The following is the resolution of the Bishops:—

"That the consideration of all the subjects, submitted to the present meeting, be adjourned to the National Synod to be held on the Tuesday after the summer meeting of the Board of the College of Maynooth, and the preliminaries of the synod be arranged and agreed to by the Archbishops, who will communicate the same to their respective suffragans".*

In addition to other reasons likely, as I have already observed, to suggest this resolution, they probably hoped that such a solemn assembly would be more likely to arrive at the much desired result of uniformity of practice in the vexed questions that had already arisen, and were being daily multiplied, than any less formal meeting; while the dignity of a national synod would invest its decisions with

* Vide *Dublin Evening Post*, 10th November, 1849.

an authority, and conciliate for them a respect, which could not fail to insure their general acceptance.

At all events, so little had the "Roman Court" to do with this idea of a national synod, that it is said the first intimation which the people of Rome had of it, was through the Dublin newspapers. Perhaps the feeling at Rome, when the news reached there, was one of alarm rather than of pleasure, fearing that it might have some political meaning. It should be remembered, that all this took place before there was any question of Dr. Cullen's appointment to the Archbishopric of Armagh; and that the only effect his appointment had upon the matter, was that he was able to convoke the Synod canonically, and that the period for holding it was postponed from June to August.

Professor Cairnes makes another mistake about the Synod of Thurles, when he tells us that the condemnation of the colleges was carried by a majority of one. It is to be observed that the Bishops commenced their synodical proceedings regarding the colleges, by *unanimously* accepting the Papal rescripts which condemned them, and ordering their public promulgation. Consequent upon this, three courses were open to the Synod for adoption:—

1° To simply reiterate the condemnation of the colleges, as intrinsically dangerous to faith and morals;

2° To prohibit, *under canonical censures*, every ecclesiastic from having any official connection with them;

3° The extreme measure of interdicting from the privileges of the Church all persons who should frequent them.

The Synod was unanimous as to the first point, not contenting itself with merely accepting the Roman condemnation, but in a formal decree concurring in this condemnation.

It was the second point, the prohibition of ecclesiastics *under pain of censure*, which was carried by a majority—this majority was not however, of *one*, but of *four*. The smallness of the majority shows the indisposition of the bishops to adopt extreme measures; and, therefore, there was no danger that the Synod would adopt the third course just mentioned.

This story of the "majority of *one*", is an excellent illustration of an old adage. It was coined and put into circulation within a week after the celebration of the Synod, and has ever since been handed about with implicit credulity, as if the genuineness of the metal was so self-apparent as to need

the testimony of no assayer. The only way of explaining it is this.

Three of the Irish Bishops were not *actually* present at the Synod. But they were represented by Procurators, chosen exclusively by themselves, who sat in the Synod as their representatives, holding their proxies, possessing the same privileges, and exercising the same powers, and to the same extent as the absent Bishops themselves could have done, had they been present. These Procurators were as much members of the Synod, as was any Bishop, or as would have been the Bishops whose delegates and representatives they were. It would be not only erroneous, but ridiculous, to fancy that it is the Episcopal *order* which confers the right of sitting in the Synod; and that no one could have a vote in such a body, unless he were also entitled to wear a mitre. That Mr. Cairnes should labour under such a misapprehension of Catholic practice is both intelligible and pardonable; but he is not therefore justified in translating his blunder into a *fact.* It is quite possible that among the *Bishops* actually present, there was only a majority of one for the prohibition, under censure, of ecclesiastics from having any connection with the colleges. But this was not the case, with regard to the members of the Synod, who were all alike canonically empowered to vote and decide, upon all matters submitted to the deliberation of the Synod. Of the members of the Synod, it is quite certain, that a majority, not of *one*, but of *four*, enacted that ecclesiastics should not under pain of censure have any official connection with the colleges.

A further series of errors, into which Professor Cairnes has fallen regarding the Synod of Thurles, is contained in his story about the "the sick bishop", to whose untoward absence he attributes the fact that the colleges were condemned at all.

"The condemnation was only carried by a majority of one; not only this, but—what may not be so well known—even this slender triumph was obtained by questionable means—through an accident improved by an artifice. During the sitting of the synod, a bishop, known to be favourable to the colleges, fell sick; his place was at once filled by Dr. Cullen with a delegate of opposite views; the sick bishop recovered; but it was not deemed advisable to restore him to his place till the vote on the colleges had been taken" (pages 7, 8).

It is difficult to conceive how any man of intelligence, however ill-informed, could have penned this passage, in which the only correct statement is that a bishop fell sick; and even this is correct only in a very modified form. To explain what could have given any pretext for such misrepresentation, I must observe, that it had been arranged that the bishops, and as many of the ecclesiastics in attendance as could be accommodated, should take up their residence in the spacious college buildings at Thurles during the celebration of the Synod. One of the bishops became unwell; and by the advice of his physician, he left the college, and resided outside during the remainder of the Synod. But, he was not prevented by his indisposition from being present at the synodical meetings and taking part in their deliberations. So that, for the purposes of the Synod, he cannot, with accuracy, be represented as having fallen sick; nor could his recovery, however gratifying to the kindly feelings of his friends, have increased his synodical efficiency, which had never been in the slightest degree impaired. Hence, the three assertions:

1° That "his place was at once filled by Dr. Cullen with a delegate of opposite views";

2° That "the sick bishop recovered" so as to be able to resume his place; but

3° That "it was not deemed advisable to restore him to his place till the vote on the colleges had been taken";

are all at variance with fact, and without any foundation. There is something painfully grotesque in the ignorance which could imagine it possible that Dr. Cullen would dare to exclude from the Synod one of the bishops summoned to attend it, or that he would venture to appoint a "*delegate*" of another bishop. Of whom would the person so appointed be the *delegate?* certainly not of the bishop who did *not* delegate him as *his* representative.

But after all, Professor Cairnes has laboured in vain, and was but losing his time, while drawing this imaginary cartoon of Dr. Cullen's anti-college artifices. Let us suppose for a moment that all this story about the "sick bishop" is strictly true, that his unfortunate absence was the only thing which rendered the condemnation of the colleges possible, that he was excluded from the deliberations of the synod "till the vote on the colleges had been taken". What fol-

lows? There will still remain the fact that, upon his "restoration to his place", *he signed the condemnation of the colleges.* This is indeed a fact, which "may not be so well known" to Professor Cairnes, but which I commend to his attention when he is next disposed to repeat the statement "that the condemnation was only carried by a majority of one, and that even this slender triumph was obtained through an accident improved by an artifice". Is Professor Cairnes acquainted with the acts of the Synod of Thurles? If he is not, what are we to think of his undertaking to inform the world concerning things, with which he is himself wholly unacquainted?

On the subject of the condemnation of the Colleges Professor Cairnes has a note: "Condemned; although (as it may surprise some of our readers to learn) only nine years before, the same mixed system of education which the Queen's Colleges represent, had been sanctioned by the same infallible authority in the person of Gregory XVI.". As one of his readers, I certainly was surprised, for there never was a decision of Propaganda accepting mixed education. The only thing done was to abstain from condemning the National System of Education, in order that every bishop might use his discretion within his own diocese. Professor Cairnes founds his assertion upon a passage in an article of M. de Laveylé in the number of the *Revue des Deux Mondes* for the 1st of January—a curious authority, certainly, upon Irish ecclesiastical matters!

Can it be that the Protestant professor is indebted for his "Facts" on "ultramontanism" to his "dissenting" Catholic fellow-labourer? The following passage from Mr. Whittle certainly shows a community of idea between them, which is worthy of note:

> "The *Mirari vos* of Gregory XVI. in 1831, condemned the doctrine of religious toleration, but the letter of the Propaganda, in reply to the Irish bishops ten years later, accepted mixed education".

In a previous part of the passage just alluded to, Mr. Whittle says that "Ultramontanism was felt in all its rigour in 1849, not that many of the later acts of Pius IX. might not ibe paralleled by those of Gregory XVI.; but the proceedings of the latter were of only partial application, adapted

to the peculiar circumstances of each locality". As Mr. Whittle has, no doubt, made a thorough study of all the public documents issued by the Papal government, perhaps he can point out those documents issued by Pius IX., which contain principles different from those issued by Gregory XVI.? If he intends to convey the opinion that the encyclical, *Mirari vos*, and the letter of Propaganda to the Irish bishops in 1841, differ in principle, he has been singularly unfortunate.

It is not my intention to discuss any of the many subjects which Mr. Whittle has gleaned from the pages of the *Dublin Review*, or point out his misconceptions of the commonest principles, with which educated Catholics are supposed to be familiar, or the unfair and always illogical use which he makes of many matters, and all of which he has so amusingly mingled into a confused mosaic. But it is right, when crude opinions and erroneous statements are thrust before the public for the express purpose of damaging a public measure, to show by some examples that the whole fabric is worthless. For this reason I shall say a few words on the subject of religious toleration, because it is a matter which has been grossly misrepresented.

The document to which Mr. Whittle alludes, as "the *Mirari vos*", was an encyclical addressed to the whole Church, and was not "adapted to the peculiar circumstances of a locality". He says it condemned the doctrine of religious toleration; but he has omitted to explain how. The Bishop of Orleans, Monseigneur Dupanloup, in his pamphlet on the encyclical *Quanta curâ*, of December, 1864, distinguishes two kinds of toleration—one religious, or indifferentism, and the other political. By religious toleration is meant the doctrine, that in the sight of God all religions are equal. If this proposition were accepted, it would obviously be of no importance what religion a man professed. This kind of toleration is the logical consequence of a denial of revelation, and is incompatible not only with Catholicism, the fundamental principle of which is, that the religion taught by the Church is alone true, but equally so with the belief in an inspired Bible.*

* "Latitudinarians, we are told, while they profess charity towards all doctrines, nevertheless count it heresy to oppose the principle of latitude. It cannot be wondered at, therefore, that Lord Carlisle denounced, under the name of intolerance, not the forcing of consciences, for this is done by

Political toleration, on the other hand, is the perfect equality of all men in everything before the law, no matter what their religious opinions may be. In a mixed community where persons do actually profess many forms of religious opinion, it is simply impossible that the State could undertake to decide which form of religion is the true one, which false; for the State is but the organ of the whole community, and should therefore be inconsistent with itself if it undertook to incline to one form rather than another. Hence all opinions (so long as they do not sap the principles of social order)

the system of education he supports, but firm and undoubting faith in any creed. 'When we', he said, 'indeed look a little backward and around us, and consider that it has pleased the Almighty to permit the various creeds and churches of Christendom to be supported and adorned by such men as Luther, Bossuet, Fénelon, Jeremy Taylor, John Wesley, Bishop Hall, Dr. Chalmers, and Channing,—men with the fire of divine eloquence on their lips, and the teachings of divine piety in their hearts,—surely there can be none of us who must not think how likely it is that in many points he must be wrong, how impossible it is that in all points he can be right'. It is difficult to overrate the importance of this statement: it was made by the representative of the sovereign in the presence of the representatives of the several Queen's Colleges; the highest dignitaries of the state stood by his side; no voice was raised to question it; its sense was not obscure; it dealt not only with one of the most momentous questions that can occupy the human mind, but with one which greatly influences human conduct. In one word, the Lord Lieutenant here enunciated the principles which govern the teaching of the University at whose solemn session he presided. Those principles, we freely admit, if founded on truth, would go far to justify the manner in which religious teaching is dealt with by that University. The argument is, that because Bossuet and Channing had 'the fire of divine eloquence on their lips, and the teachings of divine piety in their hearts', no certainty is attainable on those points on which these eminent men differed; the points, therefore, upon which no one can be certain are those which separate the Catholicism of Bossuet from the Unitarianism of Channing. It has been well said, that in all schools and universities there is a contract, expressed or implied, between the teacher and the learner, as to the principles on which the one agrees to teach, and the other to learn. The terms of that contract, as regards the Queen's Colleges, are here plainly stated. Henceforth no parent of a student in them can fairly complain if he finds that the general tone of thought impressed upon his son's mind is in accordance with Lord Carlisle's announcement. And yet, if the proposition so authoritatively enunciated be true, St. Athanasius could not have been certain that Arius was a teacher of falsehood; the Council of Nicea blasphemously erred when it declared that it was infallibly guided by the Holy Ghost; the solemn decrees of that Council dealt with points on which it is impossible to know whether it decided rightly or wrongly; and the Emperor Constantine was the maintainer of true Christian liberty when he asserted that Athanasius and Arius 'agreed in fundamentals', and that the great question at issue between them was one of no importance".—*Home and Foreign Review* for January, 1863, p. 36.

must be alike overlooked, and their professors equally accepted.*

When religious toleration, then, is condemned, it is religious indifferentism, and not politico-religious toleration. And if at any time the latter seems to be implied in this condemnation, it is either a mistake of the advocate, or because politico-religious toleration is made a cloak for the introduction of doctrines subversive of the existing form of government. If a community profess but one form of religion, I can understand the State pleading the inexpediency of permitting the introduction of opinions which, under cover of religious propagandism, may originate political and social disturbances. Is it not illegal, for instance, to preach atheism in England? Is not intolerance to Catholics defended on the ground that the constitution of the United Kingdom is essentially Protestant, and that it is therefore inexpedient to remove obnoxious oaths, or make any other just changes which Catholics require? Do not the Orangemen of Ulster breathe "the bracing atmosphere of a British community"? Nay, do they not say that the only taint in that atmosphere is

* Among all Catholics, probably, but most certainly among "Ultramontanes", Mr. Whittle will not be considered so reliable an exponent or Catholic doctrine, or of "Ultramontane tenets", as Father Perrone, fof thirty years Professor of Dogmatic Theology in the Roman College, and still Consultor of the chief Roman Congregations, and universally looked up to as the head of the Roman Theological School. In his treatise *de Verâ Religione*, he establishes twelve propositions, which, according to him, contain the sum of what every Christian must hold concerning the true religion. The twelfth and last of the series is as follows :—

"Tolerantia Religiosa est impia et absurda".

Now let us hear the exposition of this proposition, given by this great theologian, who, even Mr. Whittle must admit, has a better claim than himself to lay down Catholic doctrine with authority.

"Duplex distinguitur tolerantia: politica seu civilis, et theologica seu religiosa; quarum prima dici potest extrinseca, altera intrinseca. Tolerantia politica est libertas seu facultas, quam princeps vel respublica tribuit civibus, eam profitendi religionem, quam quisque maluerit. Religiosa est expressa vel tacita professio veritatis omnium religionum omniumque sectarum, quâ scilicet quilibet tenet religiones omnes aut sectas aeque veras ac bonas, hominique proinde omnes aeque salutares esse. Juxta istud principium nulla religio vel secta potest aliam tanquam falsam accusare ac respuere; atque inde oritur *indifferentismus*, quem vocant, erga religiones omnes utpote quae tum verae, tum bonae, tum divinae cum esse possint, perinde est unam potius quam aliam profiteri et sequi.

"Nos hic de tolerantiâ politicâ *non* disserimus; dantur enim nonnulla rerum adjuncta, in quibus ea non modo *licita*, sed etiam NECESSARIA est". —PERRONE, *de Vera Religione*, Pars Altera, Prop xii.

Popery? It seems the mere breathing of the Ulster atmosphere affects the moral constitution of some men; else how can we account for this advocate of "independent Catholicism", Mr. Whittle, being so forgetful of the principles upon which he condemned the encyclical *Mirari vos*, as to write the following passage: "The national feeling evinced by Catholics at the time [*i.e.*, 1829] was the only thing that made emancipation reasonable" (p. 32). So that political intolerance may be reasonable "in the bracing atmosphere of a British community", provided it be employed by a faction in support of ascendancy over mere Irish Catholics; but, in the dull mediæval atmosphere of Rome it is unreasonable! Is this the opinion of English liberals? Are Irish Catholics alone outside the pale of their toleration? Evidently Professor Cairnes and Mr. Whittle think so, or they would not venture to address to them some at least of the arguments they have employed.

Professor Cairnes tells us that Doctors Murray and Crolly, the Archbishops of Dublin and Armagh, approved of the statutes of the Queen's Colleges, which were submitted to them, and that the name of Dr. Murray was amongst those of the original members of the Queen's University senate. This is to some extent true, and, as I have said before, if the moderation of these men had been strengthened by a few concessions in practice, and by a just recognition of Catholics in the senate of the University, and in the appointments to the professorships, there can be no doubt the colleges would have been received in a different spirit by both clergy and laity. If, as Professor Cairnes says, "a few more years of their gentle and enlightened rule would have carried with them in support of the Colleges, as it had already carried with them in support of the national schools, the great body of the clergy", the greater must be the blame which they deserve, who marred that happy result. And are not the opponents of the government proposals now working to mar a second attempt to effect the same object? It would, however, be a great mistake to suppose that, because Dr. Murray was willing to give a trial to the Queen's Colleges, and opposed to the withdrawal of the deans of residence, he had definitively accepted the principle upon which they were established, or was opposed to the establishment of a separate Catholic University. At the conclusion of

the Synod of Thurles, a synodical address to the Catholics of Ireland was read. When the reading of it had been finished, Dr. Murray rose, and is reported to have said, that although there were some expressions upon which he would be disposed to offer some slight amendments, yet fearing he might injure the value of the document, which was an admirable one, he would not do so, but he begged to propose it for the *unanimous* adoption of the Synod. Dr. Cullen, the president of the Synod, proposed to have the document read, paragraph by paragraph, in order that he might suggest those amendments, but Dr. Murray declined to do so. Another bishop still living, then rose, and said that there were some points which he would like to see modified, in order not to wound the delicate susceptibilities of the people of Ulster. I believe the document was then read and amended as proposed. Such is the account of the synodical address, which was generally current at the time, and which I have reason to believe is substantially correct. Yet that document, which Dr Murray thought so admirable, contained the following paragraph:

"It is by the sternest sense of duty—by a painful but irresistible feeling of necessity, that we are compelled, dearly beloved, to announce to you, that a system of education fraught with grievous and intrinsic dangers, has, within the last twelve months, been brought to your own doors. It is presented to you, we deplore to say, in those Collegiate Institutions which have been established in this country, and associated with the name of our august, most gracious, and beloved Sovereign. Far be it from us to impugn for a moment the motives of its originators. The system may have been devised in a spirit of generous and impartial policy; but the statesmen who framed it were not acquainted with the inflexible nature of our doctrines, and with the jealousy with which we are obliged to avoid everything opposed to the purity and integrity of our faith. Hence, those Institutions, which would have called for our profound and lasting gratitude, had they been framed in accordance with our religious tenets and principles, must now be considered as an evil of a formidable kind, against which it is our imperative duty to warn you with all the energy of our zeal, and all the weight of our authority".*

* The Synodical Address of the Fathers of the National Council of Thurles. Dublin, 1850, page 8.

The passage is perfectly compatible with Dr. Murray's action regarding the Colleges; but while it fully bears out what I have said above, it proves that he had not accepted them definitively. I think the true solution of Dr. Murray's interest in the Queen's Colleges, is to be found in the letter of Lord Clarendon to him, part of which I have already quoted at p. 18. He, and no doubt Dr. Crolly also, thought "that in the council, professorships, and other posts of each college", the Catholic religion would be fully and appropriately represented. Had he lived to see the gradual elimination of the Catholic representation from "the council and professorships", small as it was at first, he would have regretted—not his moderation—but the blow dealt to every rational attempt to settle the vexed question of education, by the non-fulfilment of the promises which were the groundwork of that moderation.

There is one other error which I must correct, and it is this—that the idea of an Irish Catholic University was first suggested by Dr. Cullen and the Synod of Thurles. That idea was in the mind of many Irish Catholics long before the passing of the Act of Parliament establishing the Queen's Colleges. I have already shown that the foundation of such an Institution was the second of the three proposals made, several years before, to Parliament, by Mr. Wyse, for connecting intermediate with university education. It was also frequently suggested by the Pope, and especially recommended in the rescripts of 1847 and 1848 about the Queen's Colleges. The first practical step towards embodying the idea is due to Richard Devereux, Esq., of Wexford, who, in a letter to the Very Rev. Dr. Spratt, dated 28th January, 1850, offered to begin the work by a donation of £200, as soon as treasurers should be appointed. Before this the matter was much discussed in the newspapers, and a committee had actually been formed to promote the object. The subject had attracted so much attention, even before Mr. Devereux's practical letter, that the *Times* noticed the matter on the 24th of January, and asserted the impossibility of such an attempt succeeding, saying:—"You cannot, and you will not. The Romish priesthood cannot educate. They have, as a body, neither the moral nor the physical means, the minds, the learning, nor the money". The first address of the committee, of

which Dr. Spratt was honorary secretary, was issued in March, 1850. The funds collected by this committee were afterwards handed over to that appointed by the Synod of Thurles.

I shall summarize here the misstatements of Professor Cairnes and Mr. Whittle, regarding Irish ecclesiastical matters, which I have pointed out in the preceding pages:—

I. Dr. Cullen was not appointed Archbishop of Armagh in defiance of the immemorial usage of the Irish Church, but in accordance with the provisions of the brief of Propaganda of 1829.

II. Dr. Cullen was not a monk, nor director of the Irish department of the Papal government.

III. Dr. Cullen was not appointed Apostolic Delegate in 1852, but in 1850; he was never appointed delegate simply. The powers of a delegate vary with the functions delegated; those of Dr. Cullen are confined to the causes arising out of the special legislation of the Synod of Thurles, and are, so far as interference with the jurisdiction of other bishops, nothing.

IV. Dr. Cullen had nothing to do with the first idea of calling a national Synod: he was appointed Apostolic Delegate as Archbishop of Armagh, in order to convoke and preside over it canonically.

V. The Holy See equally did not originate the idea of the Synod, and consequently "Ultramontanism", as such, had nothing whatever to do with the matter.

VI. The object of convoking the Synod was not the discussion of the Queen's Colleges only; other grave matters occupied its attention. Of the sixty-nine pages containing the printed decrees of the Synod, two only are occupied with the Queen's Colleges.

VII. The simple condemnation of the principles upon which the colleges are established, was carried unanimously, and not by a majority of one, the prohibition, under pain of censure, of ecclesiastics connecting themselves officially with them, being the proposition carried by a majority. The majority, however, was not of *one* but of *four*.

VIII. Dr. Cullen did not secure this "majority of one" "through an accident improved by an artifice". Dr. Cullen did not appoint a delegate of opposite views to

"fill the place" of a "sick bishop". No "sick bishop" was, "upon his recovery", "not restored to his place till the vote upon the Colleges had been taken". No bishop "fell sick" and "recovered" during the Synod, in the sense that he did not take part in its deliberations and votes, even "upon the Colleges".

IX. The Most Rev. Dr. Murray, whatever may have been his views about the practical relations of the Catholics of Ireland to the Queen's Colleges, agreed in the simple condemnation of the principles upon which they are founded.

X. And lastly, the idea of a Catholic University did not originate with Dr. Cullen, or with the Synod of Thurles, steps having been taken before the one came to Ireland, or the other was held, to establish such an institution.

I have now shown that, even if we fully admit in theory the principle of the mixed system as regards university education, it is not practically applicable to Ireland. First, because in order that it might be equitably or successfully carried out, we should be in the enjoyment not only of political and religious, but also of educational, equality; secondly, because a chief want of the Catholic system of intermediate education, is an intellectual head or University; thirdly, Trinity College, Dublin, which is Protestant in theory and practice, and the Queen's Colleges, which are, except in name, thoroughly Protestant institutions, being wholly unconnected with our intermediate schools, cannot possibly perform the function of intellectual head to them; and consequently, fourthly, because there is an absolute necessity for a Catholic University, which alone can perform the function of intellectual head of our schools, and enable Catholics to put their superior education on a level with that of Protestants.

I have further shown that what is usually assumed to be the opinion of educated lay Catholics, is simply that of a few barristers, for the most part educated in Trinity College; and that the real opinion of Irish Catholics, of which unfortunately English statesmen have until lately apparently known nothing, is very different.

I have clearly proved that the number of Catholic students now receiving academical education, or what might

be conventionally considered as such, is wholly disproportionate to the number of the Catholics belonging to the learned professions, and wealthy classes, and to the number of those receiving education in superior and collegiate schools.

I have likewise shown to what length the Queen's College party have gone for the purpose of exciting the prejudices of liberal Protestants, and fanning the intolerance of the friends of that religious ascendancy which is the root of all the ills of Ireland, by misrepresenting either through ignorance or design, almost every event in Irish Catholic ecclesiastical affairs, in any way, however remotely, connected with the Catholic University.

These conclusions fully justify the government in admitting that we have a grievance, and in endeavouring to find a remedy for it. They have entered on the right path of justice, and I hope they will not be deterred from making this first step towards establishing true religious equality, by the opposition of the strangest alliance which has ever been formed against the claims of Irish Catholics.

One of the strangest sights, truly, which have been lately witnessed in Ireland is the movement set on foot by Trinity College in favour of "united" education. The institution which opens its professorships to *Protestants* of all nations, and advertises for a *Protestant* porter, at length acknowledges that the honest principle of ascendancy is dead, and the mourning cloak of "united" education must be put on. It is ambitious of coöperating, where it once ruled, with the Presbyterians and Wesleyans in their efforts to maintain a monopoly of higher education. This alliance will do more to injure in the eyes of Catholics the principle of free non-denominational education, and to prevent it from being carried out, where circumstances might be favourable to its equitable and successful application, than the most strenuous efforts of its opponents. Indeed no opponent, in my opinion, has ever inflicted a deadlier blow upon the Queen's Colleges than Professor Cairnes. The alliance of all Protestants against the trifling concession offered to Catholics, and the manner in which the attack has been conducted, make it the duty of Catholics of all classes to come forward, and, in concert with the bishops, insist upon a settlement of the question once for all—a settlement in which the interests of religion on the one hand, and the rights and educational

wants of the Catholic laity on the other, shall be equally taken care of. How this may be best effected, appears to me to be a question which lies exclusively between the government and parliament on the one hand, and the Catholic bishops, clergy, and laity on the other, and with which Protestants, as such, have no right to concern themselves.

I remain, etc.,

WILLIAM K. SULLIVAN.

53 Leeson Street, Upper, Dublin,
21st March, 1866.

Lithomount
Pamphlet
Binders
Gaylord Bros. Inc.
Makers
Syracuse, N. Y.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA
3 0112 124389682